

Orville T. Huggins to be postmaster at Belmont, Wis., in place of T. C. Snyder, deceased.

Bert Piepenburg to be postmaster at Mountain, Wis., in place of Marinus Jensen, deceased.

George H. Drake to be postmaster at Rothschild, Wis., in place of Clytie Geiger, removed.

WYOMING

Charles M. FitzMaurice to be postmaster at Greybull, Wyo., in place of B. R. Jones, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4 (legislative day of January 3), 1929

SPECIAL COUNSEL

Owen J. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, special counsel, to have charge and control of the prosecution of litigation in connection with certain leases of oil lands and incidental contracts as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 54, approved February 8, 1924.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Victor Allen, Bushnell.

MONTANA

William G. Hunter, Boulder.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 4, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Knowing the fullness of Thy mercy and the majesty of Thy love we would again, dear Lord, revive the ministry of praise. In the ages to come we hope to serve Thee by praise, but here and now we can serve Thee best by service. We thank Thee that out of the gates of Thy throne flow the streams of benevolence that sweeten the bitter waters of afflicted and sorrowing human life. In the name of Him who achieved miracles of restoration and recovery we ask the blessing of comfort and healing upon the stricken multitudes of our country. O Thou in whom purity, goodness, and power came to their full fruition, stay Thou the contagion that is abroad in our land. Bring to all our people new strength, new hope, and new vision. O lift the curtains of the world and show Thyself to be great and holy, and may humanity everywhere fall at Thy feet with joy. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 15569. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

RECLASSIFICATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, I desire to direct the attention of this body to a bill which I have just placed in the hamper, a companion bill to a bill offered in the Senate yesterday by Senator BROOKHART. This bill attempts to bring about some sort of justice and equity in connection with the carrying out of the varying features of the Welch bill, the salary increase bill. When we in the last session passed the Welch bill we thought we were at least going to give some sort of justice to the rank and file of the civilian employees, but unfortunately in the carrying out or in the administration of that act inequalities which heretofore existed were greatly aggravated. If any of you go to the various departments and you want to find out some information as to how that act was administered, you will find a great deal of dissatisfaction, a great deal of injustice. You will find instead of a leveling of the inequalities that the injustices, inadequacies in salary, and discriminations as to grade have greatly increased

in the administration of this act. The bill which I have offered seeks to remedy to a great extent those injustices, and I ask your kindly consideration of it, particularly the members of the Civil Service Committee. I acted as one of the House managers in the conference on the Welch bill. I held out for the Senate bill because it was more liberal than the House bill. It was fairer. A spirit of economy—I should say parsimony—prevailed, dictated from above. The administration would not pay the price of giving the rank and file a living wage. My bill and that of Senator BROOKHART will give complete satisfaction.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I request that my colleague, Mr. DOWELL, of Iowa, be given leave of absence for 10 days on account of a death in his immediate family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SANATORIUM, MARION, IND.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 14153, now on the House Calendar, with reference to an appropriation for the Marion National Sanatorium.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on December 17 the House had under consideration H. R. 14153, to authorize an additional appropriation of \$150,000 for the construction of a hospital annex at the Marion (Ind.) Branch. The discussion of this bill indicates considerable misinformation and lack of understanding of the purposes of this appropriation and the reason for the additional amount.

The Sixty-ninth Congress authorized an appropriation of \$700,000 for this sanatorium—\$600,000 of which was made available for the construction of three cottages and \$100,000 for the hospital annex. Since this authorization the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department has been making definite plans for the construction of these buildings. He finds and advises that the \$100,000 provided for the hospital annex is not sufficient to give the required relief and states in a letter to the Secretary of War that an additional \$150,000 is necessary. In order that the Members of the House may be more fully acquainted with the Marion Sanatorium, I am submitting a statement which covers not only the work which is being done by the hospital but gives a good résumé of the equipment. I would especially call attention to that paragraph concerning the treatment hospital which states that at the present time about 40 terminal cases of paresis are cared for, is overcrowded and the beds occupied by these cases of paresis are needed for other patients with disabilities requiring special treatment. To correct this situation, it is proposed to construct a building to be used as an annex to the treatment hospital, this building to have a capacity of not less than 50 beds for the accommodation and proper segregation of these terminal cases of paresis. The building would be located immediately in the rear of the present treatment hospital and operated as an annex to the treatment service. As indicated above, such a building would materially relieve the congested situation on the treatment hospital and afford far better care for this special type of patients.

The Marion National Sanatorium was formally opened for the care of ex-service men suffering from nervous and mental diseases January 1, 1921. At that time there was available for occupancy approximately 300 beds. A large proportion of the hospital facilities were being reconstructed so as to properly care for patients of this type. The capacity was rapidly increased to 1,012. These beds were occupied almost as rapidly as buildings were completed. On February 20, 1923, a hospital unit for tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric patients was opened with a bed capacity of 80 beds, this increasing the capacity of the hospital to 1,092. For approximately two years the entire hospital has been filled to capacity, and during the past year and a half there has been at all times a waiting list of from 40 to 60 to 70 patients. It is ordinarily considered good hospital practice for hospitals of this type to have at least 10 per cent vacancy in order to facilitate transfers necessary for better care and administration and to properly segregate the different types of mental diseases. Owing to the large number of applications for admission that has been received, for over a year the number of vacant beds has at all times been less than 3 per cent. This has resulted in the following condition, namely, that whenever it was necessary to transfer a patient for medical or surgical treatment to the treatment hospital, it was necessary to transfer some one out to another building, and this in turn demanded four to six transfers.

It can readily be seen that this is not good hospital practice and does not make for the best care and administration. The

number of applications for admission is increasing rather than decreasing, and from all sources of information throughout this section of country, it would seem that this condition will obtain for an indefinite period. Although there is a Veterans' Bureau hospital with a capacity of 500 beds at Chillicothe, Ohio; one at Camp Custer, Mich., bed capacity, 500; limited facilities at Edward Hines, Jr., Hospital, Chicago; and a newly opened hospital at Great Lakes, Chicago, for the same type of cases, still the need for additional beds is urgent, and it would seem that an increase in bed capacity at the Marion National Sanatorium is the logical solution of this problem, in view of the fact that this hospital has been operating for over five years successfully.

There is maintained an exceedingly well-trained, well-organized, and efficient medical staff to which only minor additions would be necessary if additional beds were provided.

There is a nursing corps of 55 graduate registered nurses, especially trained in the care of nervous and mental patients. This nursing staff is exceedingly efficient and would require only a moderate number of additions. The other hospital personnel is well organized and efficient.

There is at this hospital one of the best-equipped clinical laboratories in the country. It is adequately personneled to care for the present patient population as well as any other additional patients in the future.

There is an exceptionally well organized and equipped occupational-therapy school housed in a specially designed and constructed building for this purpose. It is in charge of a chief aide with 12 assistant aides, directly under the supervision of the medical director and superintendent.

There are electro and hydro therapy departments fully equipped and have sufficient capacity to take care of additional patients.

There is maintained a general library of 4,863 volumes, and in addition to the books listed there are 61 weekly and monthly magazines and newspapers provided. This library is housed in a most splendid building equipped with reading rooms and an amusement hall.

There is a very commodious and well-equipped gymnasium of sufficient capacity to care for the needs of even a larger hospital than at present. The physical rehabilitation work carried on in this gymnasium is under the direction of a physical director and an assistant who have had long experience in this work and are exceedingly efficient.

There is also maintained a commodious theater, where picture shows, vaudeville, and other entertainments are given three times a week throughout the season.

The reservation consists of 333 acres, 120 of which is under cultivation.

The executive, finance, quartermaster's, and commissary departments are fully organized and are functioning in a most economical and efficient manner. These departments are all adequate to properly administer a hospital of increased capacity.

All the necessary utilities, such as water supply, electric power, heat, and sewerage, are installed. The only additional requirements for a hospital of increased capacity would be minor additions to the heating plant consisting of one 250-horsepower boiler.

From the above it can be readily noted that, first, the need exists for additional beds for neuropsychiatric cases; second, that with an institution fully equipped in all departments and proper utilities already existing additional hospital facilities can be provided at a far more economical figure than could be done in case another neuropsychiatric hospital were to be constructed from the ground up. It is believed that new hospital buildings could be constructed here in the minimum period of time, and as rapidly as completed the necessary additional personnel could be provided and the additional 250 beds contemplated thrown open for the reception of patients in a much shorter time than would be possible under any other condition.

The four building, with a capacity of 250 beds, asked for, are needed for very definite and specific reasons.

The treatment hospital, where at the present time about 40 terminal cases of paresis are cared for, is overcrowded and the beds occupied by these cases of paresis are needed for other patients with disabilities requiring special treatment. To correct this situation, it is proposed to construct a building to be used as an annex to the treatment hospital, this building to have a capacity of not less than 50 beds for the accommodation and proper segregation of these terminal cases of paresis. The building would be located immediately in the rear of the present treatment hospital and operated as an annex to the treatment service. As indicated above, such a building would materially relieve the congested situation on the treatment hospital and afford far better care for this special type of patients.

One building of approximately 65-bed capacity is urgently needed to relieve the congestion on the reception service. The number of extremely psychotic patients received on this service has steadily increased and the facilities on the reception service where these patients must necessarily be kept for a period of observation, while adequate when the building was constructed a few years ago, are entirely inadequate at the present time and from the type and number of applications received for admission, it is believed that this situation will be a permanent one. Therefore, the construction of this building is deemed of the greatest importance to the proper administration of the reception service.

The other two buildings proposed are to be used for the care and segregation of other types, mainly, the various forms of dementia præcox which constitute a large percentage of admissions.

As the situation now exists, the four new buildings with a bed capacity of 250, now under construction, will give relief from the present congestion in all departments, thereby permitting a better classification, proper segregation, and more satisfactory results in the treatment of all patients. Finally, and of the greatest importance, it would afford relief to a large number of ex-service men with nervous and mental disabilities throughout this district, who are and will be, in the future, in urgent need of hospital care and for whom no hospital facilities are available.

JUSTICE FOR FORMER EMERGENCY OFFICERS

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 10436, introduced by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Speaker, supplemental legislation is greatly needed to correct the excessive disparities between the pay of those former emergency officers, originally appointed lieutenant colonels, majors, captains, and first lieutenants under section 24 of the act of June 4, 1920, and officers of the pre-war Regular Army now in those grades. I feel sure these inequalities and unfair, unjust discriminations against the emergency officers were never intended by Congress, would never have occurred had Congress been properly and fully advised in the matter at the time of the passage of the pay readjustment act in 1922, and will quickly be wiped out when Congress realizes the situation.

This pay act was a measure intended to equalize conditions, to partially recompense the emergency officers in pay for what they had lost or been deprived of by various unjust and discriminatory measures, rulings, constructions, and acts. In order to fully understand the purposes of this bill and its provisions the first thing to do is to see what it does not do.

It does not in any way affect or change the promotion list; nobody loses or gains a single file. It has nothing to do with retirement. It does not apply for any longevity or "fogy" purposes. It does not in the least conflict or interfere with any past or pending legislation and is not included in any other bill. This corrective legislation is needed irrespective of whether any other pending bills pass or fail. Nobody loses a single dollar by its provisions. It does not grant any double benefits, for when one is promoted he gets no benefit from this bill; it only helps those who are not promoted. It is not opposed by any class, for opposition or amendments to it would be without real justice and merit, only an attempt by some to have themselves included in the bill, get something for themselves, right or wrong, or object simply because they do not get something. Further, it does not in any way change the principles of the pay act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 631), nor its rates of pay and allowances or schedule of years.

On the contrary, this bill merely supplies an accidental omission in said pay act, benefits about 2,200 former emergency officers in the matter of their pay only, without injuriously affecting anybody in any way. It includes everyone possible under the provisions and principles of the pay act.

It merely allows the former emergency officers appointed first lieutenants, captains, majors, or lieutenant colonels as of July 1, 1920, under the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 759), to retain the equivalents, or constructive periods, of 3, 7, 14, and 20 years, respectively, given them in the pay act to put them in the second, third, fourth, or fifth pay periods, and to add to such terms their actual service, and thus be enabled to advance to a higher pay period when not promoted. This is the whole sum and substance of this bill. As the law now is, if promoted, they keep this constructive service, have it to start, only lose it when not promoted, the very time they need

it most. For the cardinal principle of the pay act as set forth in the report (No. 926) on it is to help those not promoted, to "protect the individual in the case of abnormally slow promotion."

And it is principally the former emergency officers who have been and are suffering from "abnormally slow promotion." Beginning with July 1, 1920, literally thousands of pre-war Regulars have been promoted to major generals, brigadier generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors, but with the small exception of about a dozen old majors, nearly all of whom are now dead or retired, no former emergency officers have been promoted to any of these grades. A careful investigation of the hearings before the committees, their reports, and the discussions in Congress relative to said pay act discloses statements by Senator Wadsworth, Representatives McKenzie, WILLIAM B. OLIVER, JOHN Q. TILSON, BYRNS, and Gen. John J. Pershing, showing it was the purpose and intention to grant the former emergency officers these periods of 3, 7, 14, and 20 years of constructive service for all pay-period purposes. By inadvertence Congress failed to make it apply in event the officer was not promoted. (See p. 6540, vol. 62, pt. 6, and pp. 6622 and 6821, vol. 62, pt. 7, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; also hearings on pay act on November 25, 1921, before a joint committee, p. 109; and Rept. 926 on pay act of 1922, p. 8.)

After the World War the Army was reorganized, mainly under the act of June 4, 1920, which contains several restrictions and limitations for the former emergency officers which were not held applicable to the pre-war Regulars. These were as to the grades the emergency officers could fill, the small number of them appointed in the higher grades, the limits as to age, requirements as to examinations, and position on the promotion list. By various interpretations, constructions, and rulings, made either contrary to the legal opinions of the established authorities, or without any proper opinions, the former emergency officers were placed in unfavorable positions in several ways. The selection of these former emergency officers to be appointed and the arranging of the promotion list were done by boards composed entirely of pre-war Regulars.

Having this in mind, Congress passed the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, endeavoring to equalize matters by making it possible for the former emergency officers to start in higher pay periods, to advance in pay periods, and get additional pay, since their chances to be promoted in grade had been rendered very small, or greatly deferred.

For this reason and on account of their greater age, education at their own expense, their experience, World War service, judgment and training, all of which they brought as a voluntary contribution to the Army, the former emergency officers appointed colonels were considered as having 26 years' constructive service and placed in the sixth pay period; those appointed lieutenant colonels were considered as having 20 years' constructive service and placed in the fifth pay period; those appointed majors were considered as having 14 years' service and placed in the fourth pay period; those appointed captains were considered as having 7 years' service and placed in the third pay period; and finally those appointed first lieutenants were considered as having 3 years' service and placed in the second pay period. The pay act establishes six pay periods, with base pay for the first of \$1,500 a year, progressing up to the sixth with a base pay of \$4,000 a year.

This act puts in the sixth pay period the pre-war Regular colonels having over 26 years' service, and these former emergency officers appointed colonels, without regard to their length of service, so these latter are considered as having such 26 years as constructive service for pay-period purposes only. But actually only 5 emergency officers were appointed colonels out of the 599 colonels authorized by the act of June 4, 1920, which required that—

a suitable number be appointed in each grade below brigadier general.

It also includes in the sixth period the emergency lieutenant colonels promoted to colonels, irrespective of their length of service, whilst the pre-war lieutenant colonel promoted to colonel must have over 26 years' service. So the emergency lieutenant colonel retains his constructive service when promoted.

The fifth pay period embraces pre-war lieutenant colonels with over 20 and less than 30 years' service and those former emergency officers appointed lieutenant colonels without regard to their length of service, so these latter are considered as having the needed 20 years as constructive service for pay-period purposes only. But actually only 14 emergency officers were appointed lieutenant colonels out of the 674 lieutenant colonels authorized by the act of June 4, 1920. It also includes emergency majors promoted to lieutenant colonels, without regard to their length of service, whilst the pre-war Regular

major thus promoted must have over 20 years' service to advance to the fifth pay period. So the emergency major retains his constructive service when promoted.

Certainly the emergency lieutenant colonels not promoted and having 10 years' actual service should be allowed to add this to their 20 years' constructive service to make the 30 years needed to advance to the sixth pay period. This the pay act accidentally omitted, but this bill supplies it and cures the defect.

Under the present law the pre-war Regular lieutenant colonel serves 10 years at most in the fifth period, then advances to the sixth period whether promoted or not, but the emergency lieutenant colonel not promoted must have 30 years' actual service before he can advance to the sixth period. As he had to be over 45 years old to be appointed and must retire at 64 it is impossible for him to thus advance to the sixth period. This inequality, discrimination, and injustice this bill rectifies and removes by adding to those in the sixth period the emergency lieutenant colonels, not promoted, who have completed 10 years' actual service.

The fourth pay period embraces pre-war majors with over 14 and less than 23 years' service, and those former emergency officers appointed majors without regard to their length of service, so these latter are considered as having the needed 14 years as constructive service for pay-period purposes only. But only 208 emergency officers were appointed majors out of the 2,245 majors authorized by the act of June 4, 1920. It also embraces emergency captains promoted to majors without regard to their length of service, whilst the pre-war captain promoted to major must have over 14 years' service, so the emergency captain retains his constructive service when promoted. Emergency majors not promoted and having 9 years' actual service should be allowed to add this to their 14 years' constructive service to make the 23 years necessary to advance to the fifth pay period. This is what the law now accidentally omits and this bill supplies.

Now, the pre-war Regular major serves nine years at the most in this fourth period, then advances to the fifth period whether promoted or not, but the emergency major not promoted must have 23 years' actual service before he can advance to the fifth period. As he was on the average about 43 years old when appointed and must retire at 64 scarcely any can thus advance to the fifth pay period. This inequality, discrimination, and injustice this bill also rectifies and removes by adding to those in the fifth pay period the emergency majors not promoted who have completed nine years' actual service.

The third pay period embraces pre-war captains, with over 7 and less than 17 years' service, and these former emergency officers appointed captains without regard to their service, so these latter are considered as having the needed 7 years as constructive service for pay-period purposes only. It also embraces emergency first lieutenants promoted to captains without regard to their length of service.

Emergency captains not promoted and having two years' actual service should be allowed to add this to their constructive service to make the 17 years necessary to advance to the fourth pay period. This is what the law now accidentally omits, but this bill supplies. Now the pre-war Regular captain serves 10 years at the most in this third period; then advances to the fourth period whether promoted or not; but the emergency captain, not promoted, must have 17 years' actual service before he can advance to the fourth period. This inequality, discrimination, and injustice this bill also rectifies and removes by adding to those in the fourth pay period the emergency captains not promoted who have completed 10 years' actual service.

The second pay period embraces pre-war first lieutenants with over 3 and less than 10 years' service and those former emergency officers appointed first lieutenants without regard to their length of service, so these latter are given the needed 3 years as constructive service. Another inequality is corrected in this bill by also adding to those the fourth pay period those appointed to the Army on July 1, 1920, as first lieutenants who have been promoted to captains and who have had 14 years' actual service.

Former emergency officers appointed colonels are not included in this bill because they are already in the sixth or highest pay period, and this bill in no way affects them; they can not be included.

Former emergency officers appointed second lieutenants were not given any constructive service by the pay, as they needed none, so they can not be and are not included in this bill. Besides, they have all been promoted to first lieutenants or captains and are all now in the third, or captains' pay period.

Moreover, the second lieutenants are much younger and will be able to acquire sufficient actual service, before retirement, to advance to higher pay periods; they had no just claim for any constructive service and were not given any in the pay act.

Under the requirements, a former emergency officer must be past 36 years of age to be appointed a major, but about 1,200 pre-war Regulars under 36 were made majors, many at the immature ages of 26, 27, 28, or 29.

With the pay act operating as at present, there are great discriminations against the former emergency officers in several ways. Pre-war majors are actually receiving more remuneration than even emergency colonels or lieutenant colonels. And pre-war majors, younger on the average by about 10 years than the emergency majors, doing exactly the same work, are receiving from \$140 to \$160 more each month than the emergency major. Even after this bill becomes the law, these pre-war majors will still receive about \$70 a month more than the emergency majors.

It is estimated that the greatest cost of this bill will be for the first year, approximately \$900,000, but this is not "the annual additional cost," since the increased cost will decrease rapidly each successive year as these former emergency officers die, resign, retire, or advance into higher pay periods by length of service, irrespective of this bill.

The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate favorably unanimously reported upon bill S. 3569, when identical with H. R. 10436. (See S. Rept. No. 962, 70th Cong., 1st sess.)

When it was under discussion before the whole Senate, Senator DAVID REED, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, supported it strongly, stating that the pay bill of 1922 gave a constructive credit of 14 years to certain officers—the former emergency officers appointed majors—at the beginning of their service, but by a holding—or omission—

denies them this same constructive credit from then on—

When not promoted. He further said:

This is the result of a technicality that did not occur to anyone in Congress or in the department. This bill will go very far toward relieving the discontent among the emergency officers who were taken in in 1920. It merely carries on the constructive credit for service that they were given at the beginning of their term. I believe it is fair and I hope it will be passed. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1928, p. 8464.)

And the Senate, on May 23, 1928, unanimously passed the bill. On the floor at the very last minute an amendment was presented adding almost 2,000 more captains to the bill who have no right or reason to be in the bill. The amendment is worded—

or whose present rank as captain dates from July 1, 1920, or earlier.

This was never considered by the Senate Military Committee, no testimony was ever taken to support it, nor did the Senate have the opportunity to fully consider it. This amendment brings about 2,000 additional captains within the benefits of the bill, with a consequent increase in its cost of over 250 per cent. These captains are by no means entitled to such treatment under the principles of the pay act.

Congress did not intend to advance them to the fourth or higher pay period except by actual years of service. The majority of these 2,000 officers were appointed to the Army in the grade of provisional second lieutenant and have already realized unexpected and abnormally swift promotion. All are favorably placed on the promotion list to the detriment of most former emergency officers. The pay act contemplates that an officer entering the service as a second lieutenant shall serve a minimum of 3 years in that grade, 7 years as a first lieutenant, and 7 years as a captain, a total of 17 years, before advancing to the fourth pay period—unless promoted to a field grade, in which case he reaches the fourth pay period after 14 years of service. Congress gave these additional 2,000 captains no constructive service for advancement to the fourth pay period and never so intended. The present amendment would elevate them to the fourth pay period with only 10 years' actual service, instead of 14 or 17 years. The present average age of these officers is about 36 years, while the present average age of the captains affected by the original bill, without this amendment, is about 44 years, a difference in age, experience, and maturity, which of course explains the original appointment of the latter group as captains and the purpose of Congress in allowing them 7 years of constructive service for pay-period purposes.

The balance of the group benefited by the amendment is composed of former emergency officers originally appointed in the grades of second or first lieutenant and who have already profited by immediate promotion and advancement of one or two pay periods. Their average age is also about 36 years. To give them the same constructive service as is given those originally appointed captains is illogical, unnecessary, was never intended by Congress, and was not done in the pay act of 1922, which this bill does not change in principle. Such a grant would ele-

vate officers appointed second lieutenants to the fourth pay period seven years before that period would be reached by many officers simultaneously appointed as first lieutenants. This amendment should be stricken out, the substitute amendment adopted, and the bill passed. This substitute amendment at the end of the first section on page 3, after the word "service," changes the period to a semicolon and adds the words—

and also to captains of the Army who were appointed to the Regular Army under the provisions of the first sentence of said section 24 in the grade of first lieutenant and who have completed 14 years' service.

TRANSMISSION IN THE MAILS OF POISONOUS DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3127) to amend section 217, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is this a privileged bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands. There is an identical bill, as the Chair understands, on the House Calendar. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONVICT-MADE GOODS

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7729) to divest goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by convicts or prisoners of their interstate character in certain cases, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I should like to call the attention of the chairman and the other members of the conference committee on the part of the House to the third amendment of the Senate to the House bill:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "otherwise," the Senate adopted this amendment: "Provided, That this act shall not apply to the preparation or processing of farm products so as to make same suitable for use by the manufacturer in the making of any manufactured article."

Mr. Speaker, the penal institutions of some of the States, including the State of Michigan, manufacture canned goods. I am not sure, with this amendment as it reads now, whether canned goods would be excepted from the provisions of the bill or not, but it seems to me there would be no uncertainty about it if the first part of the Senate amendment should be adopted and the other part eliminated. For example, if the House conferees and the Senate conferees would agree to leave in this language—

Provided, That this act shall not apply to the preparation or processing of farm products—

and eliminate the rest of the Senate amendment, it seems to me there would be no question but what canned goods would not come under the provision of the bill; but, with the qualifying clause in the bill—

so as to make same suitable for use by the manufacturer in the making of any manufactured article—

I am not sure whether they are included or not. I would like to recommend to the conferees that they give this particular amendment very serious consideration, and if it can be arranged so as to except from the provisions of the law canned goods, it seems to me it would be a very desirable thing to do.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are two or three other amendments, one of them extending the time of its going into operation to five years. It seems to me this amendment ought to prevail.

The second amendment provides—

except commodities manufactured in Federal penal and correctional institutions for use by the Federal Government.

I should be very glad if the gentleman would let us have now his interpretation of the meaning of that particular amendment, which is amendment No. 2.

Mr. KOPP. My understanding of the purpose of that amendment of the Senate is this: By our present law and practice the Federal Government does not sell goods upon the market that it manufactures in the Federal penitentiaries, but it manufactures goods for Federal purposes. The intention of this amendment, as I understand, is to save that right to the Federal Government

so that it will not be interfered with by this bill when it undertakes to manufacture goods at Leavenworth or Atlanta or at its institutions in the other States. I understand that is the purpose.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have tried to get a copy of the bill, but find none available at this time. Is this the bill which gives the States authority to regulate prison-made goods moving in interstate commerce?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; I believe it has been so called.

Mr. SCHAFER. The Cooper-Hawes bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think it has been so known.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. This is the Cooper-Hawes bill with Senate amendments. The Attorney General requested that the amendment that the gentleman from Tennessee spoke about a moment ago he adopted. Personally I can not see any necessity for it at all, because the Federal Government at this time does not permit any convict-made goods to go on the market in competition with free labor and private industry.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. However, there is no law preventing it, is there?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not know about that. I believe there is. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa if there is such a law at the present time.

Mr. KOPP. I so understand.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The Attorney General seemed to think it ought to go in the bill.

In regard to the other amendment, which the gentleman from Michigan spoke about, I believe that ought to be carefully considered by the conferees, for I am of the opinion that it might open the door for all agricultural products to be exempt from the provisions of this law if the amendment remains in the bill as it came from the Senate. I hope the conferees will follow the advice of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and try to have that remedied before it comes back to the House.

As to the amendment extending the time from three to five years, I have no serious objection to that, and I do not believe any other member of the Labor Committee has any serious objection to it.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under the reservation I would like to state that I hope the House conferees will oppose the Senate amendment which makes certain exceptions.

If the bill is right in principle, it should be enacted into law in the form it passed the House by an overwhelming majority vote. There should be no exemptions, as provided for in the Senate amendments. Those who produce agricultural products are entitled to protection from unfair competition of the product of convict labor.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, still further reserving the right to object, if I may, in order to make this statement—one aspect of this subject which I fear most Members have overlooked, and which I can not but believe my friend who has just addressed the House has overlooked, is the humanitarian aspect of it as applied to the prisoners themselves. The fact is that this bill, if it shall stand the test of the courts, is going to work a very great hardship at least for a time. The question of what shall be done with the prisoners is going to be a tremendously pressing problem. They can not be, or should not be, kept in idleness; that is not in the interest of the prisoner and it is not in the interest of society.

I can not resist the feeling that certain influences all along have overemphasized the amount of competition which has been given to legitimate labor and legitimate industry by prison labor. I am not at all sure that we are doing the right thing in passing the bill at all, and if it is passed I certainly think this amendment extending the time for five years should be approved, because they will need that time to study the problem in order to know what to do in a humanitarian way for these prisoners.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that the prisoners should have some labor to perform; this bill is not going to stop the prisoners from working. It merely gives the States the right to regulate the sale of convict-made goods. We have a law in the State of Ohio regulating the sale of convict-made goods within our borders, and last year \$3,000,000 worth of convict-made goods from other States were sold in Ohio in competition with free labor and legitimate business, over which our State had no control whatever. This bill provides that when a State has a law regulating the sale of convict-made goods, made in said State, it shall also have the power to regulate the sale of prison-made goods imported from other States.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is there any good reason why there should be any exception as embodied in the Senate amendment?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. As far as the amendment granting extension of time for two years more, we can offer no serious objection to that, for it is giving them a little time to reestablish the whole prison system of employing prisoners, and by giving them five years instead of three, which the bill provided when passed by the House, they will have sufficient time to readjust the system.

Mr. SCHAFER. How about the other amendment, excepting certain products?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I have expressed myself on that. I am not in favor of that Senate amendment as it now stands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the conferees on the part of the House, as follows: Mr. KOPP, Mr. ZIHLMAN, and Mr. CONNERY.

MICHIGAN HABITUAL CRIMINAL LAW

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the titles assumed by individuals have such high-sounding names that their utterances may receive more attention than would otherwise be justified. I have here a clipping from the New York World of January 3, 1929, which quotes one Dr. Clarence True Wilson, who calls himself the "executive secretary of the board of temperance, prohibition, and public morals of the Methodist Church."

This statement is so un-Christianlike, so extreme, so wild, so intemperate that it is well and necessary to distinguish it and make clear that it can not possibly represent in any way the views of the thinking men and women of the great Methodist Church.

This man Wilson, referring to the case of Mrs. Etta Mae Miller, mother of 10 children, who was sentenced to life imprisonment for selling a pint of liquor in violation of the State prohibition law, approves of the life sentence and apparently regrets the punishment could not be more severe. This man Wilson is quoted as saying:

Our only regret is that the woman was not sentenced to life imprisonment before her 10 children were born.

In other words, Doctor Wilson, under the guise of speaking for the church, approved of the life sentence, and if he were to carry out to a logical conclusion his approval and his recommendation we would have to amend our laws so that before a woman is married a board of temperance and morals would first have to pass upon her qualifications to bear children, particularly as to her future or potential proclivities for selling liquor any time during her natural life. Or perhaps the "doctor" would have Congress prohibit by law any person not approved by him, or convicted of violating the liquor law, from bearing children. He gloats and rejoices at the cruel life sentence imposed on this unfortunate woman.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just a moment. A more extreme statement has never been expressed by anyone outside of an insane asylum, and I state frankly that if Doctor Wilson were a resident of New York City, or if he were a resident of Washington, D. C., I would ask for a commission to test his sanity. His inhuman and unnatural views as expressed by him are not human and are not normal. I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Why does the gentleman say that Doctor Wilson is speaking for the Methodist churches of this country?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I say that he is not. And that is exactly the fact that I am trying to bring out. I say that he is not speaking for the Methodist churches of this country. It is exactly my purpose in taking the floor, because some good people might read this statement and be misled.

The gentleman has now my purpose in calling attention to this statement. This is the kind of thought that is back of the extreme prohibition idea. This is the kind of a man who assumes leadership in prohibition enforcement. Think of demanding a prohibition test before marriage, and then life imprisonment if there is any belief of future violations before the bearing of children. I should like to hear from anyone on the floor of this House who will stand up and approve of Doctor Wilson's statement. It is too bad that this board

of public morals, prohibition, and temperance can not get an amendment to the law which would let them pass upon the qualifications of people who want to marry with power to impose a life sentence if they are not of their own particular standard of prohibitionist. Let me point out to Doctor Wilson that we have never heard him attacking some of the largest contributors to the prohibition chest who are making huge profits out of prohibition. If this is the best example of the leadership of thought in prohibition, then make the best of it.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman from New York is an authority on prohibition matters. Has the gentleman any information indicating whether or not the Anti-Saloon League returned the \$500,000 donation to that organization by the notorious Kresge, of Detroit?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, I think possibly the Anti-Saloon League, feeling that Mr. Kresge needed more money for his orgies in New York and elsewhere in violating the law, might have returned a part of it to him. I do not know.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 15848) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplementary appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permit me to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] when it is expected to take up this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. To-morrow.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman does not hope to pass the bill to-morrow?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would like, if possible to do so. Of course, it would depend entirely upon the demands for general debate.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The reason that I am asking the gentleman is because I would like to have some understanding of when we shall vote on the bill or when we shall take it up under the 5-minute rule. I know that there will be some considerable debate asked for on this side of the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. We will be disposed to grant all reasonable requests for debate.

Mr. BYRNS. I understood from the gentleman from Kansas that there would be no disposition to consider this bill under the 5-minute rule before Monday.

Mr. ANTHONY. I stated if there was no considerable demand for debate I would hope to pass it to-morrow, but it is agreeable to me to utilize to-morrow for general debate.

Mr. BYRNS. On this side of the House there will be requests for at least two hours, and possibly more, for general debate. To-morrow is Saturday. Why could not the gentleman agree to take this up under the 5-minute rule on Monday?

Mr. TILSON. Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Mr. BYRNS. Then Tuesday.

Mr. ANTHONY. It ought not to take long on Monday after general debate to pass the bill under the 5-minute rule. We ought to dispose of it in an hour.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it the purpose to set aside this War Department bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the understanding.

Mr. TILSON. That was agreed when the War Department bill was called up for consideration.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Let us agree to take this up under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday, then.

MICHIGAN HABITUAL CRIMINAL LAW

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great solicitude expressed on the floor of the House by distinguished Representatives from New York, Wisconsin, and other States, I thought it might be of interest to the House to take about two minutes this morning to read into the proceedings of the House an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of January 2, 1929, which I trust will be given due attention by these gentlemen:

MICHIGAN'S OWN BUSINESS

Prosecuting Attorney Barnard Pierce, of Ingham County, made a statement that needed utterance when he said to the jurymen in the Etta Mae Miller "fourth-offense" case: "This is no business of anyone outside of Michigan. Your decision is no business of Illinois, New York, or any other State, or of the Federal Government."

For propagandist reasons which have nothing whatever to do with an enthusiasm for impartial and effective administration of law, certain persons and publications in more or less adjacent parts of the country have been gobsquadding with great assiduity over the Miller case, and in effect have been attacking the whole of Michigan's penal code because in one particular it displeases them. These weepers and wallers are not at all interested in our State's fight against banditry and general crime. Generally speaking, they are interested only in booze and they resent the punishment of anybody caught peddling it.

[Applause.]

That statement may seem rather sweeping, nevertheless we think it is substantially true.

The Free Press is not among those who consider the Michigan penal code perfect as it stands. Those who drew it up had no idea that it would prove to be without flaws or opportunities for improvement. But it is better than anything of the sort the State ever had before, and it is far better than anything most other parts of the country possess, and it can be amended by the legislature as the experience of two years may show it ought to be amended, without the assistance of self-appointed advisers in New York or Illinois or anywhere else.

[Applause.]

The editorial speaks for itself. It only needs to be said that the Detroit Free Press is one of the leading papers of the State and the country, and certainly has not heretofore been accused of being fanatically dry in either news or editorials.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended, so that I can ask him a question.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, there must be an end to this. I object.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11469, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11469, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11469) to authorize appropriations for construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a little information about these amendments. Is there ever going to come an end to the addition of appropriations for the development of West Point Military Academy? As I remember, the House passed this bill just in the form the War Department said they wanted it. The Senate has added several hundred thousand dollars to it. Is there any basis for these proposed additions? And what is likely to be the attitude of the House conferees toward them?

Mr. MORIN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that the bill originally passed by the House was a bill sent up by the War Department and introduced by myself. It was to conform to the continuous building program at West Point. In that program there was an item for the building of two apartment houses. After the proposed bill was introduced the Secretary of War decided that but one apartment house should be built and the balance of the officers provided for in separate quarters. He sent a letter to the committee recommending that we increase the item for officers' quarters in order to build the separate houses. He also recommended the elimination of two items not considered of immediate necessity.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is, postpone several items; not anything cut out, but to postpone several items?

Mr. MORIN. The House in passing upon the bill did not act on the Secretary of War's later recommendation. The bill as it passed the Senate is just as the Secretary of War recommended in his second letter to our committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. What was the attitude of the Budget on the recommendation of the department?

Mr. MORIN. They approved it.

Mr. CRAMTON. What is the attitude of the conferees? Is it entirely in harmony with this proposed increase?

Mr. MORIN. Well, Mr. JAMES and Mr. McSWAIN and myself will be the conferees. I approve of it because it conforms to the recommendation of the Secretary of War, to which I have just called attention.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not going to object, as I do not know enough about it to justify me in taking such action. But I believe there should be an end to the building program at West Point.

Mr. MORIN. Of course, there should be, but that program will take some years to complete.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Committee on Military Affairs of the House intend to continue their present policy of taking over the functions of the Committee on Appropriations and prescribing just what buildings shall be constructed and how much they shall cost, even in the case of an icehouse, then I think they should come to the House with positive declarations and recommendations, and stick to them, instead of going to the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. MORIN. The committee is conforming to the program of the Budget Bureau. Formerly we did not do that. I have tried several times to have a complete program authorized, but it has been rejected. Therefore we are compelled to come in each year and ask for authorizations of just the amount needed to carry on the building program during the ensuing year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. MORIN, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. McSWAIN.

REAPPORTIONMENT BILL—MINORITY REPORT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may have five legislative days in which to file a minority report on the reapportionment bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that five legislative days be allowed in which to file a minority report on the reapportionment bill. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have planned, in making up the program for next week, to consider this bill on Thursday of next week. Will the request of the gentleman from Mississippi interfere in any way with this program?

Mr. RANKIN. I will make it three legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that three legislative days be allowed in which to file a minority report. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what deep-seated governmental policy is at stake which requires that this bill, after it was up for consideration in the House just a few months ago, should be called up hastily at this time?

Mr. TILSON. I do not think it is being very hastily called up. We are giving a week's notice now and it has been talked about ever since we reassembled on the first Monday in December, so that it does not seem to be hastily called up at all.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman misses the main part of my question, to which I would like to have an answer. However, I will ask an easy question: Is it contemplated by the leader that in case this bill is defeated in January to call it up again in February?

Mr. TILSON. No; I should not expect to call it up again as early as February, if it failed in January.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Would the gentleman from Connecticut favor a rule making this committee a privileged committee, so it can report and call up a bill whenever it desires?

Mr. TILSON. I should not favor such a rule, but I think the House ought to be in a position to execute its will at any time, as it can do in this case.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are only nine years behind now.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Senate is the cause of that, and not the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Connecticut when we will take up the judges bill? I understood it was to be taken up next Thursday.

Mr. TILSON. The judges bill will probably be taken up early the following week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15712) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15712, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15712, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations submits for the consideration of the House to-day the bill making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year 1930. The subcommittee which had charge of the preparation of this bill met on the 15th day of November and began its hearings on that day. It has been at work on the bill practically ever since that time up until the present. The subcommittee went into all matters which are covered by the bill very carefully and we feel that the hearings on this bill are quite complete and that anyone interested in any particular item can secure almost any information he may desire with respect thereto from the hearings.

I want to say that this bill does not represent the thought or judgment of any particular member but rather is it the final thought and judgment of all of the members of the subcommittee, approved by all of the members of the whole Committee on Appropriations. If you examine the bill, you will find that there are several improvements over former bills in the mechanics of the measure which is proposed here to-day, vastly improving the form of former War Department appropriation bills. The credit for that work is due almost entirely to Mr. Pugh, who has very efficiently served this subcommittee as clerk during the preparation of this bill. [Applause.]

The appropriation bill for 1930, which is now before you, carries direct appropriations for military activities amounting to \$328,038,815. It also includes contract authorizations amounting to \$3,000,000, and purchase-of-discharge funds amounting to \$300,000, in all \$331,338,815. The 1929 War Department appropriation bill carried direct appropriations of \$309,601,568.50, reappropriations of \$1,844,419, and contract authorizations amounting to \$7,115,000. The total of the 1929 bill, including reappropriations and contract authorizations was \$318,560,987.50 for military activities. For nonmilitary activities the 1929 bill carried \$88,915,653, and the 1930 bill carries \$107,089,600. The total of the two bills, including reappropriations, contract authorizations, and purchase-of-discharge funds, is as follows: For 1929, \$407,476,640.50, and for 1930, \$438,428,415.

In making comparisons, however, between the appropriations for the two years it may not be proper to include reappropriations, because they have heretofore been reported to the House in previous appropriation bills as money appropriated; neither is it proper to consider contract authorizations, because contract authorizations must be appropriated for later and will come in in the totals of later appropriation bills.

I give you these items, however, just to afford a clearer picture of what the 1930 bill does as compared with the 1929 bill.

The proper comparison of the two bills is made in the direct appropriations. The 1929 bill carried for military activities in direct appropriations \$309,601,568.50, for nonmilitary activities it carried \$88,915,653, a total of \$398,517,221.50. The 1930 bill carries for military activities \$328,038,815, for nonmilitary activities \$107,089,600, or a total of \$435,128,415. In direct appropriations the 1930 bill carries \$36,611,193.50 more than the bill for the present fiscal year.

I will state that the total of the 1930 bill is \$43,392 under the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

The principal increases in the 1930 bill under military activities are in pay of the Army, the increase amounting to \$3,215,995; post construction, the increase amounting to \$9,357,950; for the Air Corps an increase of \$8,729,141; for the United States Military Academy at West Point an increase of \$600,000; for the National Guard an increase of \$578,197; and on account of the Welch Act an increase of \$2,272,000.

In the nonmilitary activities the principal increases are \$20,000,000 on account of flood control on the Mississippi River; \$4,370,000 on account of return of contributed funds in connection with flood control on the Sacramento River; and \$1,351,000 on account of the Panama Canal.

The bill provides for an Army of an average enlisted strength of 118,750 men, the same as at present; 6,500 Philippine Scouts; and an average officer strength of 12,000.

For the present fiscal year we appropriated for about 11,800 officers and for 1930 we are providing for 200 more officers on account of increase of officer personnel in the Air Corps.

Under the Quartermaster Corps it is proposed in this bill to purchase 259 motor vehicles; 24 trucks at a maximum cost of \$6,000 each, 100 trucks at a maximum cost of \$3,000 each, 15 ambulances at a maximum of \$3,000 each, 10 passenger cars at a maximum of \$2,500 each, 50 passenger cars at a maximum of \$1,500 each, and 60 solo motor cycles at a maximum of \$325 each.

The bill carries language which will permit the purchase of a larger number of these motor vehicles with the same funds if it is found possible to do so. Sometimes in buying motor vehicles in large quantities they can be purchased at reduced rates, so the Quartermaster Corps is not confined to the exact number stated in the bill and if they are able with these funds to purchase more the language will permit them to do so.

It might interest the members of the committee to know that on November 1, 1928, the Army had on hand a total of 17,581 motor vehicles. Of this number 7,667 were operating, 9,914 were not operating, but of this latter number 6,363 were serviceable or economically repairable, and 3,551 were unserviceable and not economically repairable.

The question of horses and mules is one to which the subcommittee having charge of the bill has given very careful consideration.

Under the provisions of this bill the Army will purchase 1,500 horses at an average estimated price of \$165 per head, and 1,000 mules at the same average price. In 1929 there were purchased 2,300 horses and 1,700 mules.

The total requirements of the Army in horses and mules under the reduced allowance based on a strength of 118,750 men is 24,296 horses and 14,913 mules, or a total of 39,209 animals. On July 1, 1928, we had on hand 22,886 horses, 13,583 mules, or a total of 36,469. This was a shortage of about 2,400 horses and 1,300 mules below the reduced requirements for the present strength of the Army; but in investigating this question the committee went into the matter of privately owned mounts of officers.

We found that 1,856 officers of the Army own a total of 2,548 horses which they have purchased with their own funds. The law provides that an officer below the grade of major owning one horse shall receive from the Government \$150 per annum on account of that horse. If he owns two horses, he receives \$200 per annum. The horse is also foraged and stabled. Above the grade of captain, officers may own two horses up to the rank of general, and then they may own three horses, for which no allowance is paid by the Government, but those horses are foraged and stabled by the Government.

The committee, as I said a moment ago, considered this question carefully and it came to the conclusion that if the Government is paying \$150 a year for one horse privately owned by an officer and \$200 a year for two horses privately owned by an officer, then those horses should be counted in estimating the total number of horses on hand. They are provided in this way in lieu of a Government horse. An officer is given his choice of riding a Government-owned horse or owning his own horse, and if he owns his own horse he is paid this allowance. If he is paid this allowance, in the opinion of the committee that horse should be counted in determining the total number of horses on hand.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is this allowance for horses applicable to officers who are not mounted?

Mr. BARBOUR. Only to officers required to be mounted. A provision was inserted in the bill limiting the allowance to one horse, and the limit of the number of horses stabled and foraged to one horse. That will reduce the expense of the Government for privately owned mounts by the amount allowed for the second horse and the amount paid out on account of forage and stabling for the second and third horses.

Counting the horses privately owned, we find there is a very small shortage in the actual requirements of the Army at this time; possibly a few hundred at the outside.

The status as to horses on June, 1930, is that we will be 354 short on the basis of the revised peace allowance and the purchase of 1,500 horses during the next fiscal year, taking into

account also 1,856 privately owned mounts. As to mules, we will be 1,967 short. So you will see as to horses that the mounts privately owned practically balance the requirements.

Mr. WURZBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Certainly.

Mr. WURZBACH. Under the \$150 annual allowance to an officer, what does that represent—the purchase price?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is supposed to be in lieu of the purchase price. Some of the officers purchase very fine horses, and the cost of those horses amount to a considerable sum of money. An officer who wants to own his horse generally prefers to have a better horse than the Government furnishes.

Mr. WURZBACH. He wants a more expensive horse than the Government furnishes? And it is more expensive to the Government.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is more expensive. If the Government pays \$150 per year for a privately owned horse, almost the cost of a Government horse would be paid to the officer in one year.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Certainly.

Mr. BRIGGS. To what extent have the horses and mules been displaced by motors?

Mr. BARBOUR. That is receiving considerable attention from the War Department. We find some very prominent officers in the Army who are strongly in favor of horses, saying that we will require practically the same number all of the time. We find some who say that motors will replace the horses to a considerable extent. At the present time the division artillery is horse drawn, while the heavier artillery is motor drawn. As I say, that matter is receiving the attention and study of the War Department, and it may well be considered in view of the rapid growth of the use of motor vehicles in the commercial world.

Mr. BRIGGS. I saw somewhere that during a bomb and mimic warfare quite a number of horses suffered by explosions, and so forth. I wondered to what extent efforts were being made to utilize motor transportation.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is something that is receiving very serious consideration.

Now, for the housing program for post construction the bill carries \$14,441,950 and \$3,000,000 contract authorization.

Of this appropriation, \$4,800,000 will be used to satisfy contract authorizations carried in prior appropriations acts. The 1929 bill carried \$5,084,000 in direct appropriations and a contract authorization of \$2,115,000, and the 1928 deficiency act carried \$7,485,975. The total amount appropriated for post construction, including the amount carried in this bill, is \$36,854,925, with a contract authorization of \$3,000,000. That brings the total up to \$39,854,925—almost \$40,000,000 provided for post construction.

This will provide all post construction authorized up to the present time, except \$250,000 for Scott Field, in Illinois, which was stricken out of the bill in the Senate last year because of opposition there and has not been restored to the bill.

With the funds carried in the bill the housing will provide for 23,798 enlisted men, 797 noncommissioned officers, and 727 officers, 1,408 hospital beds, and provides housing for 192 nurses.

This will leave unprovided for, according to the War Department estimates, 14,602 enlisted men, 2,463 noncommissioned officers, and 3,286 officers. General Summerall, Chief of Staff, when he was before the committee, stated that progress in the housing program is satisfactory. "We are building as rapidly and as economically as possible." A table contained in the hearings gives full and complete information up to the present time of the status of every project in the housing program.

For barracks and quarters the amount carried in this bill is \$11,650,784, which is \$1,018,160 less than was carried in the 1929 bill. A decrease in this item was possible because the liberal appropriations for barracks and quarters, which is a repair and maintenance item, has enabled them to put the buildings in very good shape. Then there is the new construction coming in, which will make the repair and maintenance items less. General Cheatham assured the subcommittee that he would get by in good shape with this amount for barracks and quarters.

For seacoast defenses we are carrying along the work of installing fire-control and building emplacements for large and heavy caliber guns, acquiring lands for 16-inch gun batteries in Oahu, and for the mounting of 240-millimeter howitzers in that island. Generally speaking, the work of the seacoast defenses is being carried along and progress is being made.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. SWING. What progress is being made in the matter of heavy railroad guns, portable guns, that can be taken from one place to another? For instance, at San Diego there is nothing

in the way of guns that would serve as defense, but we have been told in the past that they were developing a gun that could be transferred back and forth as needed. Will the gentleman tell us what progress they have made in that?

Mr. BARBOUR. The Ordnance Corps is experimenting all of the time and endeavoring to improve the seacoast and field artillery, and it is making real progress along those lines. We have a certain number of mounted railway guns. There are some at Panama, there are two at Los Angeles, and there are some stationed at other places; and these, according to the reports made to our committee by the Ordnance Department, are very effective guns. As to the number on hand, I am not prepared to state to the gentleman from California, because I do not have that information at hand.

Mr. SWING. But they have been found to be practicable?

Mr. BARBOUR. They are said to be very efficient.

Mr. SWING. And their number will increase in the future?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, is there not a unit known as the regiment of railway artillery which handles that caliber and character of ordnance?

Mr. BARBOUR. The manufacture is under the general supervision of the Ordnance Department. Just what the subsidiary organization is that handles it I could not say. The operation of such guns in seacoast defense is in the hands of the Coast Artillery.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. There is a definite organization known as the regiment of railway artillery?

Mr. TABER. I understand that we have something like 188 of these railway mounted guns, many of which are at Aberdeen.

Mr. SWING. And those at Aberdeen have not yet been mounted?

Mr. TABER. There may be some there that are not mounted. I am referring to mounted guns.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I notice under seacoast defenses that there is a total sum in excess of \$3,000,000 provided, and that in the tabulation there is given something in excess of \$946,000 for insular departments. Is the gentleman in a position to advise as to what part of that sum is for the Territory of Hawaii's defenses and Oahu defenses?

Mr. BARBOUR. These seacoast defense items are divided into several different activities. There is the Signal Corps, the Engineer Corps, Ordnance, and the Coast Artillery. There are four different departments of the Army that have something to do with these seacoast defense appropriations. These appropriations carry money for searchlights in Hawaii, for emplacements for 16-inch guns in Hawaii—that is, two additional 16-inch guns which will make the total number four, and for acquiring land, 11.09 acres for howitzers, and for emplacements for twelve 240-millimeter howitzers, which will complete the emplacement project for the howitzers. There is also equipment for one antiaircraft battery, the continuation of the fire-control installation for the 16-inch guns and the large guns that are mounted in the island of Oahu. That, in a general way, covers the activities that are provided for in this bill for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Then the figure, in other words, under insular departments is practically all for Oahu defenses?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; most of it. There is something for replacement of cables in Manila and Subig Bays, but outside of that it is all for Oahu.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Can the gentleman advise the committee just what progress is being made along the line of the development of antiaircraft artillery?

Mr. BARBOUR. You will find a statement in the hearings on that which will give you, I think, very satisfactory information. Real progress, the Ordnance Department reports to your committee, is being made. Great improvements have resulted from experiments that have been carried on. They are improving their antiaircraft guns and are getting very good results. Some of the recent results are stated in the hearings. Generally speaking, there has been material improvement in the antiaircraft equipment and fire.

Mr. BRIGGS. Along with the development of antiaircraft artillery, does not the gentleman think there should be some addition to the strength of the Coast Artillery, with better equipment for antiaircraft—better equipment than it now possesses?

Mr. BARBOUR. We are providing equipment for it here; fire control for antiaircraft batteries; purchasing antiaircraft

guns; purchasing the latest models of searchlights to be used in antiaircraft fire, and so on. That work is going forward.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is that a substantial increase, so that coast defenses can be manned for antiaircraft? In my own locality I do not know of any antiaircraft guns in the coast defenses there. There are three batteries there and no antiaircraft guns at all, and but a very small skeleton organization of men to man the forts. My understanding is that all the way south, nearly from Fortress Monroe on the Atlantic and along the whole Gulf shore line, there is practically little more than a handful of coast artillery for the coast defense, and the coast defense of the South and Southeastern part of this country is entitled to more consideration than it is receiving. I am not disposed, however, to hold the Coast Artillery Corps responsible for this condition.

Mr. BARBOUR. We are carrying forward this program from year to year. Of course, the complete equipment of our coast defenses all at one time would be a very large proposition. Experiments are being made and progress is being made in development. It would not be a good business proposition to build a large number of guns which in a brief space of time might be obsolete or obsolescent. We are carrying forward now work on a considerable number of antiaircraft guns of the latest type, of a mobile type, I might say, and we think it would not be good policy to build a large number of them at one time and in a short time find they were supplanted by something more recent.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand that the antiaircraft guns should first be perfected and developed before they are purchased for distribution on a large scale. I understand that in the 105-millimeter gun changes have been made within the last year by the department, making it a more efficient weapon. I assume, however, that it will not be long before they will have fully perfected such a weapon. And then I want to know if it is the intention to give the coast defenses such equipment as may be necessary and let them have enough antiaircraft battalions to effectively man and use them so that adequate coast defense can be assured, as well as proper provision be made for the Air Service.

Mr. BARBOUR. Of course, this committee does not in any way intend to hamper the development of coast artillery and coast defenses. In fact, the committee is quite sympathetic toward that development. Just what the committee will do some time in the future we could not say at this time, but we do believe in carrying forward this program of coast defense at least in a practical and efficient way to the extent that funds available will permit.

Mr. BRIGGS. My impression is that there are only three or four antiaircraft battalions in the whole Coast Artillery Corps. Two of these are located outside in our Territorial possessions and only one or two in the United States proper. I think there should be more attention given to the creation of antiaircraft battalions to be stationed in the coast defenses along our seacoasts at home.

Mr. BARBOUR. Most of the antiaircraft batteries and equipment and personnel are overseas; that is, at Panama and the Hawaiian Islands. Those are considered to be the strategic points.

Mr. BRIGGS. I have no fault to find with that. But I am talking about the coast defenses at home which have been stripped of men. Before the war the coast defense branch of the Army had about 18,000 men. Since the war they have had only 12,000; and more than half of those have been moved to our Territorial possessions. The Chief of the Coast Artillery states in the hearings that we need 12,000 men in the United States proper.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is not necessary fully to man all our coast defenses. We have a considerable number of Coast Artillery units in the National Guard. We have also a number of Coast Artillery officers in the reserve, who are receiving training. In case of an emergency there are a number of men who are pretty well prepared to step in and man the guns that are in these defenses.

Mr. BRIGGS. My observation is that in the National Guard it is not so easy to get them into the Coast Artillery. They prefer the other branches of the service to a large extent. If we are going to have an effective coast defense, we have got to have men trained in the proper use of antiaircraft guns and in target practice. Otherwise you might have the same situation as was had at Fortress Monroe a few years ago when we lacked men of sufficient experience in antiaircraft gunnery and practice.

Mr. BARBOUR. We have highly trained men in antiaircraft artillery.

Mr. BRIGGS. But not enough of them. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is a matter for the Congress to determine. We are carrying the Army along on a basis of 118,750 men, which has been the accepted policy of Congress for a number of years past. Now, if the gentleman from Texas wants a larger Army, he is raising another question.

Mr. BRIGGS. It is more the policy that I am talking about. For instance, the Coast Artillery service seems to be stripped down to the very bone; and if they want 300 or 400 men, it seems to have difficulty in getting them; and they seem to have difficulty in keeping the depleted number they now have.

Mr. BARBOUR. You take an Artillery officer and a Cavalry officer and they will tell you the same thing. Of course, these units are not being maintained at their full war strength.

Mr. BRIGGS. I appreciate that. It is my understanding that in providing for a strength of 118,000, it is from limitation of appropriation and not of legislation; because the legislative authorization is very much higher than that. When the aircraft development under the 5-year program came along it was expected that the increase in the Air Service, both enlisted as well as officer personnel, would be in addition to the then existing Army strength, but apparently an effort has constantly been and is being made by the Budget or somebody else in executive authority to compel contribution of men from the various other branches of the service; so that, as I say, the Coast Artillery service is being stripped of its strength right along. It was the understanding that the increases in the Air Service, under the 5-year program, both in enlisted and officer strength, would be in addition to and not at the expense of other arms of the service. That was the idea I had from the debates when the matter came before the House on several occasions; and I think I interrogated the gentleman from California, the chairman of this subcommittee, whether that was not his view of it, and I think he indicated it was, and that the committee had attempted to make provision for it; but my observation and my information is that there is a great deal of resistance being offered to that effort by the Budget and in other quarters, so that other services are being constantly reduced. I want the Air Service to get all the men it needs, and I think it ought to be carried forward within the full spirit of the 5-year program; but I think the spirit of that program is that such extra men as may be needed to carry out the program should be taken into that service, in addition to Regular Army strength, and let the other services get along with the existing order of things.

Mr. BARBOUR. Coming to the Air Corps, this bill carries for the Air Corps a total of \$33,359,409. The 1929 bill carried \$24,630,268, with a contract authorization of \$5,000,000, and \$1,071,479 in reappropriations. There is no contract authorization carried in this bill, as the funds herein contained are intended to provide for the full Air Corps requirements.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is extra provision made for additional men in the Air Corps?

Mr. BARBOUR. You mean the flying cadets?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. We carry a provision in the bill for them; yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How many extra ones do you provide for?

Mr. BARBOUR. There are 296 who take a 6-month course; that is practically 300, and they take two groups of them into the course every year. There is a November course and then another one along in the spring, so that they get about 600 a year for this six months' training.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that an increase over what it has been heretofore?

Mr. BARBOUR. I believe it is. They are taking all they can possibly handle with the training facilities available.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I suppose every Member of Congress has the same problem, that there are many young men in the country who are anxious to get into the Air Corps.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is no difficulty at all in getting the finest type of young men in the country for flying cadets.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There is no difficulty, but what are the opportunities for young men getting into that service?

Mr. BARBOUR. They are giving everything they have in the way of opportunity. Of course, the Air Corps right now is going through a process of development. It has not all of the facilities it will have in the future, but with the facilities available they are taking in all of the flying cadets they can possibly accommodate.

The money carried in this bill will purchase in 1930, 275 planes for the Regular Army and 22 for the National Guard, making a total of 297. It will purchase 14 attack planes, 67 bombardment planes, 146 observation planes, and 70 pursuit planes, amounting in all to a total of 297. No training planes are provided for here, because at the present time we are 13 training planes over the present requirements of the 5-year program. At the present time or, rather, on October 1, 1928, the Army had on hand 1,005 airplanes serviceable and in good condition, on order 470 planes, and these funds will buy 297 more. These figures include 148 planes in the hands of the National Guard on June 30, 1929. At the end of 1930 we will be short something over 100 planes, mostly observation planes, but we have a very good supply of planes on hand, and the committee does not consider this prospective shortage as a serious matter; in fact, General Summerall, the Chief of Staff, when he was testifying before the committee, said:

I believe we have been procuring airplanes as rapidly as we can develop suitable types and have delivered the quantities of airplanes that we ought to have.

He specifically stated they were not short because of any lack of action on the part of Congress.

As to pilots in the Air Corps, on September 30, 1928, we had 732 Regular officer pilots and 41 enlisted pilots. We had 296 flying cadets in training at that time, and we had 63 reserve officer pilots on active duty with the Army Air Corps.

On June 30, 1929, the National Guard will have 152 planes. This will equip 19 squadrons with 8 planes each.

The National Guard has 218 qualified pilots. In the Organized Reserves we have 631 pilots of class 1, 1,000 pilots of class 2, and then I understand there is another large group of pilots who are not trained as highly as these other two groups.

The 631 class 1 pilots are men who are efficient enough at this time to be ordered into service and to take charge of flying planes. The 1,000 class 2 pilots can be brought into that condition of efficiency with a short refresher course. The other pilots would have to receive considerable training to put them in shape to be real effective pilots in the Air Corps.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from New York. Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Did the committee go into the question of the type and quality of plane furnished to the National Guard to determine whether they are as modern and as up to date in every way as may be desired for the purpose, or as modern and up to date as those furnished the regular Air Service?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. I will say to the gentleman from New York they are getting the same types of planes as the Regular Army. The National Guard is now well equipped and in 1930 will be completely equipped with modern, up-to-date planes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman has very completely answered my question by stating that they are equipped with new planes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. FURLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FURLOW. The gentleman will recall that in the 1926 Air Corps act we provided for 1,650 officers in the Air Corps at the end of a 5-year period. Can the gentleman tell the committee whether or not we are living up to that program in so far as personnel is concerned?

Mr. BARBOUR. So far as the officers are concerned, we are behind on the requirements at this time, and this is due to the difficulty that has been encountered in securing officers for the Air Corps.

As the gentleman well knows the tests that a candidate for appointment in the Air Corps must pass are very severe, and not everybody by long odds can meet these requirements, and they have experienced difficulty in getting officers from other branches of the service who could pass these tests, or even from civilian life. Their main source of supply right now is from the flying cadets. They are furnishing to-day the main supply of officers in the Army Air Corps.

Mr. FURLOW. May I say to the gentleman that my investigation convinces me that there has been no effort on the part of the War Department to give permanent commissions in the Air Corps to all the graduates from Kelly Field who would accept Regular Army commissions, men who have qualified and are qualified. The War Department has been waiting for these transfers from the other branches. As a result of this we are far behind in our program, and it is my understanding the War Department has arbitrarily advanced this 5-year program to a 6-year program, in reality, from the time it was intended to start. In so far as the statement attributed to the War De-

partment that we can not get qualified pilots at the present time I know that is erroneous. I know that Kelly Field has graduated many men who have asked for commissions in the Regular Army upon completion of training, and they have been refused. Maybe they went into the reserve, but we have lost many others by failing to take them when they were in a receptive mood. The difficulty is because the other branches have been reluctant to give up their files for the Air Corps. As a result our personnel program is behind our building program. I think we have reached a very serious point in the development of our Air Corps when we go on with the building program so far as equipment is concerned, and yet neglect a vital part of the program which is personnel.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is undoubtedly a relation between the two.

Mr. FURLOW. I understand, though, that files have been opened and examinations to fill vacancies have been called. This will help but we should be in position to fill our vacancies from recent graduating classes at Kelly Field. I hope the Congress will keep an eye on this personnel program and keep it abreast of the building program, and I hope that the Congress will make itself felt and make its voice heard so that those charged with this responsibility will know that Congress intends to have the 5-year program carried out as originally contemplated.

Mr. BARBOUR. I will state to the gentleman from Minnesota that the reason for providing money in this bill for 200 additional officers is to take up that slack in the Air Corps officer personnel.

Mr. FURLOW. And we never contemplated that our officer personnel would go beyond 12,000 officers.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURLOW. I yield, if the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] will permit.

Mr. JAMES. It is not the fault of the War Department; it is the fault of the commander in chief.

Mr. FURLOW. In saying the War Department, I referred to whoever was in charge down there and either puts out these orders or fails to put out these orders. Something is wrong and it ought to be corrected. The 5-year program was supposed to start July 1, 1926, and be completed July 1, 1931. Now, somebody, without authority, has advanced it to July 1, 1932. We will go into that later.

Mr. BARBOUR. For Chemical Warfare Service this bill carries an appropriation of \$1,246,776. This is a decrease of \$56,504 below the amount carried in the bill for the present fiscal year.

The bill contemplates that 21,000 gas masks shall be manufactured for the Army in 1930. We manufactured 24,000 for the Army in 1929.

They are developing a new gas mask at the Edgewood Arsenal; a mask that is far superior to anything that we have heretofore had. In view of this development and in view of the fact that our Edgewood Arsenal can be placed on a rather large production basis in a short period of time, the subcommittee felt that this provision for 21,000 gas masks for the Army in 1930 would be sufficient. The new type of gas mask that our Chemical Warfare Service is manufacturing is the best gas mask in the world. Our plant at Edgewood has a potential capacity of 8,000 gas masks per day. In 60 days it can be producing 200,000 gas masks a month; and during that period of 60 days can turn out 200,000. In view of the fact that these gas masks deteriorate, particularly the rubber element, the committee felt that the 21,000 would be sufficient to put in the bill for the year 1930; although the new mask, owing to the way it is sealed and stored, is expected to last from 10 to 15 or perhaps 20 or even more years.

Coming to the National Guard, the bill carries a total of \$32,319,798 for the National Guard. This is an increase of \$578,197 over the 1929 bill.

The strength of the National Guard on June 30, 1928, was 183,019, and it is contemplated that by June 30, 1930, the strength will be 190,000. This bill provides for some additional members of the National Guard in order to round out certain existing units.

It provides for 48 armory drills; it provides for the usual 15 days' camp instruction; and it also carries funds for new uniforms for the National Guard, \$612,890 being carried in the bill for that purpose. The committee feels that the National Guard is quite well taken care of.

As to the Organized Reserves, the bill carries \$5,533,129, and there is an additional \$224,750 of funds to be received during the fiscal year 1930 from the purchase by enlisted men of the Army of their discharges. That makes a total of \$5,757,879. This is an increase over the 1929 bill. It will train the same number of 15-day trainees as were trained during the present

fiscal year—19448. It will not train as many for periods longer than 15 days, but provides for exactly the same number of trainees for 15 days as we had in 1929.

Now as to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, there is \$2,676,817. This is a decrease as compared with 1929, but in 1930 we will have a carry-over from 1929 which will more than offset the apparent decrease.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. How much does that carry over?

Mr. BARBOUR. I understand that it is about \$500,000.

Mr. JAMES. That amount they expect to expend before June 30, 1929?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; the committee is advised that they will have \$500,000 to carry over, and with that carried in the bill it will be sufficient.

Mr. JAMES. That is the amount they said they would expend between now and June 30.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; that will not be expended and will remain available for 1930 activities.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I will yield.

Mr. McSWAIN. I want to go back to the Organized Reserves. I desire to make a statement before I ask the question. The Organized Reserves are furnishing the most economic element of national defense that our program of defense has. By the way of offsetting certain criticism I have heard made of them, I desire to say in addition and in respect to any compensation for the continuous training that they are under by way of study and answering questionnaires, taking up much of their time, that they actually expend money from their own independent resources to pay the organization chapter dues and to pay for their official organ that contains instruction as well as inspiration.

I am asking a question of the gentleman to this effect: I want to ask him as to the propriety and wisdom of having the War Department as a portion of the instruction for the Organized Reserves to take over the publication and circulation of the magazine, or inaugurate the publication of a magazine, in the interest of the Organized Reserves, so that they would not have to pay \$2 a year or more for a magazine to get information about the work of the corps. It seems to me that men who have had experience in military training constituting the reserves, not receiving any drill pay as the National Guard receives, could very well be given additional encouragement and not be put to all of the expense of the personal needs. I am asking the gentleman if any such encouragement to the Organized Reserves is in contemplation?

Mr. BARBOUR. Our committee has not considered it. Off-hand, it strikes me that the gentleman's own committee would have jurisdiction of that matter. I understand that the gentleman's committee is considering a policy with respect to the Organized Reserves and their relation to the War Department, and it would seem to me that that would be a part of that program. As far as the cost of the Organized Reserves is concerned, the figures submitted show that the average cost of the 15-day trainees was \$181.31. Of course, their pay depends on their rank or grade. The average for pay and allowance is \$135.53, their mileage average \$21.25, and the average expense of the camp per officer training is \$24.53, which makes up the total average of \$181.31 per year for each officer in the Organized Reserves who receives a 15-day training.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. In getting information regarding the civilian components, like the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the citizens' military training camps and the Organized Reserves, to about how many places did the gentleman have to go?

Mr. BARBOUR. Not many. The War Department furnished information on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and as far as we have been able to determine very satisfactory information, and also with regard to the citizens' military training camps; but in connection with the latter we generally hear some of the representatives of the Citizens' Military Training Camps Association. They are civilians who are interested in this citizens' military training camp work and are devoting their time, and some of them their money, without compensation or return to advancing the interest of these camps. On the Organized Reserves we have representatives of the War Department who appear before our committee, and then this committee has always extended to the officers of the Organized Reserve Officers' Association an opportunity to appear before our committee and have a rather full and complete hearing, at least to present their ideas in connection with the reserve officers' training. The committee has not sought their appearance, but

they have appeared before our committee and we have accorded them an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. JAMES. For instance, in order to get information regarding how much money is necessary for reserve flying, instead of getting it from the Air Corps, you have to get it from a branch of the General Staff?

Mr. BARBOUR. It comes up in the items for the Organized Reserves training, which are presented to the committee by the officers who are stationed in the War Department. One man who was principally active in presenting these items to the committee is a reserve officer who is on duty in the War Department, Major Ames.

Mr. JAMES. I read his testimony. About two years ago we tried to find out from Mr. Davison and General Fechet about how much money should be expended for the reserve flying. They had no idea whether it was \$100,000 or \$400,000, and our committee thought that that was very strange. When we looked into the matter we found that they had nothing to do with it; that it was a branch of the General Staff that determined that.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I assume that the gentleman will be generous in yielding.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. We want to have full and free discussion within the limit of time.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman has it within his power to grant himself an unlimited amount of time for adequate discussion of this important measure. With regard to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, we realize that the whole future and the strength and the success of the reserve-officer feature of the Army depends upon the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. BARBOUR. And it is getting more so all of the time.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Absolutely. I would like to ask the gentleman if any figures were presented to the subcommittee as to how many of these Reserve Officers' Training Corps trainees had already qualified and taken their commissions as second lieutenants, and, next, how many of those young men who have had commissions awarded them have followed that up by a period of training as reserve officers?

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman will find rather complete information in the hearings as to the number of Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates who have taken their commissions in the reserve. From 1920 to 1928, inclusive, the total is 28,829. I am not sure that the hearing shows the number of them that are following up their work and taking the courses of training.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman, of course, must see, manifestly, that the whole point of this is, How many of these young men are following it up?

Mr. BARBOUR. There is a considerable number of them, I should say a very satisfactory number, but I am unable to give any definite figures.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will not the gentleman put that in his remarks? It seems to me that that information might be incorporated in his remarks, if he will be good enough to extend them to that extent.

Mr. BARBOUR. For citizens' military training camps the bill carries an appropriation of \$2,742,158, as compared with \$2,801,240 in 1929. However, that apparent decrease will be more than offset by a carry-over of \$173,000 into the 1930 fiscal year. The last bill, the bill for this year, contemplated training for 35,000 trainees at the citizens' military training camps. There were actually 34,514 who completed their 30-day course of training at these camps. This bill, however, provides for an increased number of trainees and contemplates that 37,500 young men will receive the benefit of this training at the citizens' military training camps in 1930. That will be an increase of 2,500 over the number provided for for 1929.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman will recall that when this subject was up before the House at the last session some of us tried to have a sum that would provide for 40,000.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As one of those interested in this subject, may I express my very great gratification at the fact that the committee have seen fit to raise the amount of the appropriation a sufficient sum over and above the Budget estimates to provide for the training of 2,500 more boys. It seems to me, from the standpoint of those who are interested, that the committee is to be very much commended for that course.

The gentleman from South Carolina said that the reserve officers were probably the most economical feature of the national defense. Without questioning that, may I say that the training of these boys at a cost of \$69.25 a year, as is shown, is

obviously about as economical a provision for training of man power as can be conceived? The committee itself in its report asked the question as to how this shall be developed and where it will end. May I reiterate that gentlemen who are interested in the citizens' military training camps have stated on the floor heretofore that we should proceed progressively to the 50,000 mark, which was originally fixed for it; and that the results thus far in the splendid effect of the training of those boys will amply, and more than amply, justify continuing the amount, we might say progressively up to the ultimate unit of 50,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. I will say to the gentleman from New York that there is no definite policy with respect to citizens' military training camps. The full responsibility seems to fall upon the Committee on Appropriations in determining the number. We feel on the committee that it would be very advisable to have some kind of a definite policy adopted with regard to the training of the civilian branches. Then we would know what to expect each year, and Congress would know what to expect. As it is now, when the committee begins the consideration of the War Department bill, reserve officers all over the country write letters urging that we should train so many, and others urging that we should train a different number, the writers having different ideas, some feeling that we should train a certain number and others feeling we should train another number; and it is the same way with regard to training camps. The committee does the best it can under the circumstances with the funds available.

Now, for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice this bill carries \$659,500. For 1929 there was a re-appropriation of \$500,000. You will recall that last year an amendment was put on the bill on the floor of the House providing for the national rifle matches to be held this past summer. The bill as reported to the House carried no appropriation for the national matches. Subsequent to that date Congress passed a bill making the national matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, a national event, so this money for the national matches for next year goes into the bill in its regular order.

The next proposition is the ammunition to be furnished to the civilian rifle clubs throughout the country. There are nearly 1,600 of these rifle clubs. The Federal Government has been issuing to these rifle clubs about 2,000,000 or more rounds of ammunition per year.

That is a maximum of 120 rounds of ammunition, .30 caliber, and 200 rounds of .22 caliber per man shooting. The amount that is issued to any one club, however, is limited. These rifle clubs have come to expect this free issue of ammunition by the Federal Government. Following the war, when we had large quantities of ammunition on hand and no particular use for it, there was no objection on the part of anybody to giving this ammunition to these civilian rifle clubs, but now we are reaching a point where the question of our ammunition reserves has got to be one of importance, and we are squarely confronted by the question of whether or not we are going to continue to furnish this ammunition in the same quantities to the civilian rifle clubs. If we do that, we will in all probability have to buy ammunition in order to issue it to them, whereas heretofore it has been given out of war-time stocks. That is the question which confronts us, and we will have to meet it. In this bill we provide, from purchase-of-discharge funds, a sufficient amount of money to furnish the civilian rifle clubs with the amount of ammunition they are having during the fiscal year 1929.

That, gentlemen, completes the important items of the military activities, and we now come to the nonmilitary activities.

The bill carries \$3,500 to complete the plans and supervise the construction of the monument of the Unknown Soldier. A bill was passed by Congress authorizing \$50,000 for this purpose. Two thousand five hundred dollars has already been appropriated and \$3,500 more is needed for the completion of the plans and the supervision of construction, which will leave \$44,000 of the amount authorized to complete the tomb itself. We are advised that this money will be sufficient to complete the tomb.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is this the tomb here [indicating]?

Mr. BARBOUR. This is it, and I was just going to describe it to the Members of the House. This is a model of the proposed Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The act authorizing the completion of the tomb was approved July 3, 1926. It provides that the accepted design of the tomb and inclosure shall be subject to the approval of the Arlington Cemetery Commission, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the Fine Arts Commission.

The Secretary of War appointed a jury to advise him, consisting of some of the most eminent architects of the country, selected or suggested by the American Institute of Architects, and, in addition, Mr. Hanford MacNider, representing the American Legion, and Mrs. Rock, of Philadelphia, a gold-star mother. Seventy-three designs were submitted, and the design here exhibited was the final selection of this jury. Subsequently, in accordance with the law, the design was submitted to the three specifically named commissions and each was unanimously in favor of the advisory jury's selection. The accepted design was accompanied by a sketch looking to the opening up of the whole front so that there would be an ornamental setting for the tomb and that it would be a focal point of the grounds. This phase of the work, estimated to cost around \$350,000, has not been authorized. The winning design was submitted by Mr. Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor, and Mr. Lorimer Rich, architect, both of New York City.

The figures in relief on the model of the accepted design represent peace, victory, and the American soldier. The inscription, to be cut at the opposite end, has not yet been determined upon.

I think, perhaps, all of the Members will be interested in this model, because it is the accepted design for the completion of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and the money already appropriated will finish this work. The present tomb, I understand, comes to here on the model [indicating] and the balance is the superstructure that is to be placed on the present tomb. It is plain; it is not overornamental; and I think the beauty of it will appeal to almost anyone. Now, that part of the project has been authorized. It is planned, however, to build this approach, which will cost, as nearly as can be estimated now, in the neighborhood of \$350,000; and the Quartermaster General has stated to the committee that that must not be accepted as a final estimate because it may be more than that. However, I do not think anyone will object to that, because if it is to be done at all, the American people will want it done right and will not want the Congress, and the Congress itself will not want, to be niggardly in regard to the money that it expends on the memorial to the Unknown Soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. This sketch here shows the amphitheater with the tomb in the same place it is located now, with the superstructure on it, which will give you some idea of the appearance of the plan from the proposed approach. It is proposed to break through the cement wall that exists there at the present time, and this approach is to be in the neighborhood of 500 feet long, I believe 480 feet long, and something over 200 feet wide. Here is another sketch showing another view of it, which gives you a more general view of the proposed plan. You will notice it is not overdone; in other words, it is plain, it is simple, and I think in its artistic effects it is very appealing. Here is a bird's-eye view of the whole scheme or plan as it will appear from the air when completed. This part is the amphitheater. The little black rectangular mark is the present tomb, and this will be the approach as it appears from the air.

I have brought these models and sketches here to-day in order that the Members of the House might have an understanding of just what was being done with regard to the proposed Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. It is something that the people of the entire country are interested in, and when it is done they want it done right. There has been a lot of controversy as to just what, if anything, should be done, and the members of the committee feel that this plan is one that will meet with the approval of the Congress and with the approval of the people of the country generally.

For rivers and harbors the bill this year carries \$50,000,000. This is a decrease of \$5,886,310 as compared with the amount carried in the 1929 bill. We had on hand, however, a balance on November 1, 1928, of \$44,502,297, nearly \$7,000,000 of which has not as yet been allotted. Out of this money will be allotted funds for carrying on the surveys which a good many of the gentlemen living in the Mississippi Valley are interested in.

It is proposed to allot \$1,500,000, and if more funds are needed to carry on the work more money will be allotted for this activity; in fact, General Jadwin stated that if more money was needed in 1930 the Board of Army Engineers would allot it up to the amount they could spend economically and efficiently. He stated further that the work of making these surveys was

being pushed vigorously and they were being made just as fast as could be, consistent with thorough work, economy, and efficiency.

The \$50,000,000 is all that the Board of Army Engineers asked, and they assured the committee that these funds would be sufficient to carry on the work during the fiscal year 1930.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Is adequate provision made to carry on surveys in sections which have suffered from floods other than the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; I understand the surveys are being carried on in sections other than the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. BRIGHAM. And adequate provision is made to continue that work?

Mr. BARBOUR. General Jadwin assured us he would allot whatever was necessary to efficiently and economically carry on the work.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand you have allotted all that the Army engineers say they can profitably expend; is that true?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have read with a great deal of interest the way the work on rivers and harbors is being carried on, and I want to say in passing that the gentleman's knowledge of this entire situation is very illuminating and very pleasing to the membership of the House, I am sure, because it shows that the gentleman has a thorough understanding of all these activities. The gentleman's remarks are very interesting, and the liberality with which he has approached this subject is very pleasing to me, at least, as one Member of the House.

Mr. BARBOUR. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

On the item of flood control the bill carries \$30,000,000 as compared with an appropriation of \$10,000,000 in 1929. However, previous to this time there was a deficiency appropriation of \$14,000,000 for flood control, and there has also been available for the work of flood control on the Mississippi River \$12,000,000 more of previous appropriations; but the 1930 appropriation for flood control as compared with the 1929 appropriation is a straight increase of \$20,000,000.

General Jadwin, who is the Chief of Engineers, stated to the committee that this is all that could be economically expended on flood-control work in 1930. You will understand that at the present time there is a great deal of preliminary work that must be done in regard to the spillways and floodways that it is proposed to construct. Rights of way must be secured for levees and for flowage, and all of this work the Board of Army Engineers assures us is being pushed just as vigorously as it possibly can, and the report of the Board of Army Engineers on this activity, in the opinion of the members of the subcommittee, is very satisfactory. I will say that in the hearings is a brief statement by the Chief of Engineers outlining just what the plan of the Board of Army Engineers with respect to flood control on the Mississippi River is, and what it proposes to do, and anybody who wants to get a clear-cut picture of the plan can get it by reading this comparatively brief statement which takes up but a very few printed pages in the hearings. It is there available and to my mind is very interesting.

For the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers we are providing what General Wood, president of the board, stated was sufficient funds with the understanding that the board of governors has had with the Appropriations Committee, and that is that if the funds carried in the bill are not sufficient to properly care for these veterans of the wars that the Government is providing for in these homes, they will go ahead and take proper care of them, and, if necessary, come back and get a deficiency appropriation. With this understanding General Wood says that the funds carried in the bill are ample.

Coming down to the Panama Canal, it is proposed to carry on the work of the construction of the Alhajuela Dam. Funds for the Alhajuela Dam were first carried in the 1929 appropriation bill, \$250,000 to commence the preliminary work. This bill carries \$1,000,000 to continue the work of construction. It will not, however, start the actual construction work. It will build a road and allow them to continue their diamond borings and continue the various investigations they have to make in a big construction project of this kind.

The Alhajuela Dam is 12 miles up the Chagres River and will store a sufficient quantity of water to permit them to double the capacity of the present traffic of the canal without any question as to there being an ample water supply.

They are confronted at Panama at times with the possibility of a dry year, and with their increasing traffic it interferes with the transit of the large ships through the canal. The

deep-draft vessels have to be towed through the cut, and that slows up the work of operation and also makes it more expensive to operate; but the new dam, when it is completed, will provide ample water not only for doubling the present traffic capacity but, the committee understands, it will provide ample water for a third set of locks, if a third set of locks is deemed necessary.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman be kind enough just at this point to make a brief statement as to the financial operations of the canal for this year? It seems to me that is very interesting.

Mr. BARBOUR. The financial operations of the canal are very interesting.

The total net revenues for the year 1928, which is the last year available, were \$18,961,564.29. This is an increase of almost \$3,500,000 over the total net revenues for the preceding year 1927.

In arriving at these net revenues all expenses, including depreciation and amortization, except interest on the investment, are deducted. They do not deduct interest on the investment. This includes not only the canal but the business divisions that are carried on by the Panama Canal.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Can the gentleman tell what rate of interest that would pay on the original investment?

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, let us see. The total cost of the canal, including the railroad, is \$386,000,000.

The gentleman can readily estimate it. Three hundred and eighty-six million dollars was the total cost of the canal. The present Governor of the Canal Zone says that in arriving at the cost of the canal we should add compound interest at the rate of 3 per cent from the time of construction during all the time this money has been out. He says that is the proper way to arrive at the cost of the canal—that the actual expenditure does not represent it, but that is a matter of bookkeeping and accounting. The proposed method of estimating the cost of the canal suggested by the present governor perhaps would be the correct way of estimating it.

Mr. BRIGHAM. The Government is getting 4 per cent on the cost of the canal.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. The tolls for 1928 were \$26,943,513.16. The transits have been increasing until the last few months when there was a slight decrease. In 1928 the commercial transits were 17.63 per day; including all ships, transports, and Government vessels that do not pay toll, the daily average has been 19.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. The Government in business at Panama has been a remarkable success.

Mr. BARBOUR. Absolutely; and it is very well handled by the Government officials in charge of that great project.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In going back to the design for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, I want to ask the gentleman if this appropriation is made for beginning the work, it would mean a definite congressional approval of that particular design which would preclude any modification?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; it is not necessary to be made in that way. It can be authorized for completing the tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In other words, my thought is this: That there should be considerable latitude left for further discretion for any necessary modification in the design. There may be some who would criticize the allegorical figure on the front, the male figure, as hardly a sufficient representation of the American soldier—at least not as we knew him.

Mr. BARBOUR. I would say to the gentleman that when it comes to a work of art you can frequently find many differences of opinion on the same subject—some good and some otherwise.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. You do not need to be much of an artist to have some sense of fitness of things, with relation to the conception of what would be an appropriate representation of the American soldier.

Mr. BARBOUR. Those are matters which can be properly worked out.

Now that covers the more important items of the bill. There are a few matters in the bill which change our former policy in the way of limitation. For instance, it is provided that only one horse shall be allowed to an officer, and an annual allowance for forage and stabling provided. That I discussed a short time ago. Then it is also provided that the number

of officers who shall be taken into the Army during the fiscal year 1930 shall be limited to West Point graduates, warrant officers, enlisted men of the Regular Army, and persons commissioned in accordance with the law in the Army Air Corps. That is made necessary because if we do not place a limitation on it, it is liable to go over the 12,000 that we are providing for. While that might appear to be a discrimination against others who could qualify, the committee felt that we should apply some limitation at this time, and so we limited it to West Point graduates, enlisted men, and warrant officers who can qualify and men going into the Air Corps.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Is not the number of officers limited to 12,000 plus the 403 in the Air Corps?

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me ask the gentleman that question. The gentleman would know that, because it would come under the jurisdiction of his committee. Is there a limit of 12,000 on the number of officers, or is that the amount we have been appropriating for?

Mr. JAMES. My impression is that it is 12,000, by law, and that we increased the number by 403 in providing for the Air Corps.

Mr. BARBOUR. I would not state definitely, because that is a legislative matter. My understanding has been, however, that the limit was not fixed by law at 12,403.

Mr. JAMES. We increased the number of officers 403 to go into the Air Corps. I do not think that they can have more than 12,403.

Mr. BARBOUR. This is to hold the number to 12,000. This is to meet a situation which now confronts us. Next year it may not be necessary to do that.

Mr. JAMES. The language is not such that it prevents these men who graduate from Kelly Field from going into the Air Corps?

Mr. BARBOUR. Oh, no; it does not prevent them. It specifically mentions persons appointed or commissioned in accordance with law in the Army Air Corps.

There are one or two other changes in the language in the bill. One limits the activities of the post exchanges, and another one limits the procurement activities of the Army.

The committee has found that in this procurement work a large organization is being built up, composed to a considerable extent of civilians, but at the same time requiring the attention of a number of Army officers. It is being carried on under the supervision and direction of the Assistant Secretary of War, Colonel Robbins. Each time an increase in this activity occurs it means more money. The activity has been growing, until now there is a large number of people, civilian and military, engaged in this procurement work and study. The committee felt that in view of the fact that it was subject to great expansion we should put this limitation upon it and say that the funds could not be used for other procurement officers in excess of the number now engaged in that work.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman please explain about the proviso respecting the field-service appropriation, that it shall not be available for personnel services in the office of the Assistant Secretary of War?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. My recollection of that is that the Assistant Secretary of War has been calling in people from the field service for work in his office, and we have been trying to get the field rolls and the departmental rolls straightened out so that we would know that the people in the departments were being paid from the departmental rolls and those in the field service paid from the field rolls. It was to prevent the field-service appropriations being used to pay for services in the departments. Such services should be more properly on the departmental roll and can be more properly taken care of. I understand the bookkeeping system will be greatly simplified by that provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired. [Applause.]

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as an amendment will be offered at the end of this appropriation bill relating to the purchase within the United States of materials by the Army, and later a similar amendment may be offered to the Navy bill, I wish to place in the RECORD certain quotations. First, from a statement made by the president of our New England council, made recently:

We should have a law to require our Army and Navy, the military arms of our Government, to purchase their supplies within the defense of our guns. It is clearly absurd that their purchases be made abroad of those things essential in carrying on war, and things in case of war

they will need in large quantities. These purchases usually come in without paying a tariff. It seems absurd.

From an official of a department of the Government:

The law requires that the heads of departments place the orders with the lowest bidders, price and quality being equal. There is some association in Washington—I don't recall the name of it, but it is a sort of association of Government purchasing agents—and they have recently secured the introduction of a bill calling for a revision of the purchase laws. One section of that bill has revised the phrase, the conditions of which I have referred to somewhat, but to my mind not sufficiently, or not at all adequately to protect our own manufacturing interests in securing and having an even chance of getting Government purchases. The clause reads, "Orders placed on goods shall be placed with the lowest bidder, price and quality being equal." But that is not sufficient. Orders have been placed on balloon cloth, airplane cloth, silk parachute cloth, and khaki goods, and I recall an order for about 50,000 yards of expensive material which could be made in this country, I have no doubt, but it went to foreign mills because the total saving on the purchase was less than \$1,500. I am sure that the saving to the Government of \$1,500 was more than lost in other forms of revenue and taxes and wages, you might say, in one form or another, so in the end they more than lost that \$1,500.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman be willing to put his proposed amendment in the RECORD to-night, so that we may know what it is?

Mr. GIFFORD. The form of the amendment is not entirely agreed upon. We want the best expert advice that we can get, but I can read what will be very much like the amendment desired:

That the head of a department may have discretion in placing those orders whereby he may set aside bids made by a foreign mill or agent for goods, even though it is at a lower price.

In closing, I wish to repeat those words which to me and to the audience who listened seemed very impressive:

We must have a law to require our Army and Navy, the military arms of our Government, to purchase their supplies within the defense of our guns.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Aldrich	Dallinger	Hull, Tenn.	Palmer
Allgood	Davey	Igoe	Parker
Arentz	Deal	Jacobstein	Parks
Auf der Heide	Denison	Johnson, Ill.	Patterson
Ayres	DeRouen	Johnson, Ind.	Peavey
Bacon	Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Pou
Beck, Pa.	Dickstein	Johnson, Wash.	Prall
Bell	Dominick	Kading	Pratt
Berger	Doughton	Kent	Purnell
Blanton	Douglas, Ariz.	Kerr	Quayle
Boles	Douglass, Mass.	Kindred	Ragon
Bowles	Doutrich	Knutson	Ramseyer
Boyian	Dowell	Kopp	Reed, Ark.
Brand, Ga.	Doyle	Kunz	Reed, N. Y.
Brand, Ohio	Drewry	Lampert	Robinson, Iowa
Britten	Driver	Langley	Romjue
Browne	Edwards	Leatherwood	Sabath
Bulwinkle	England	Leech	Sanders, N. Y.
Burdick	Estep	Lindsay	Schneider
Bushong	Evans, Mont.	Linthicum	Sears, Fla.
Carew	Fenn	McClintic	Sirovich
Carley	Fitzpatrick	McFadden	Spearing
Carter	Fort	McMillan	Sproul, Kans.
Chase	Frear	McReynolds	Steagall
Christopherson	Free	McSweeney	Stedman
Clancy	Freeman	Maulove	Stevenson
Cochran, Pa.	French	Martin, La.	Stobbs
Cohen	Garrett, Tex.	Mead	Strong, Kans.
Cole, Iowa	Gasque	Merritt	Strong, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Gilbert	Michaelson	Strother
Combs	Golder	Montague	Sullivan
Connally, Tex.	Graham	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Connery	Greenwood	Moore, N. J.	Temple
Connolly, Pa.	Griest	Morgan	Thompson
Corning	Hadley	Nelson, Me.	Thurston
Cox	Hammer	Nelson, Wis.	Tillman
Crall	Hare	Newton	Timberlake
Crisp	Harrison	O'Brien	Tinkham
Crosser	Hastings	O'Connell	Underhill
Crowther	Haugen	O'Connor, N. Y.	Udlike
Culkin	Houston	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson, Ky.
Curry	Hughes	Oliver, N. Y.	Warren

Watson
Weaver
Weller
Welsh, Pa.

White, Colo.
White, Kans.
Williamson
Wilson, Miss.

Winter
Wright
Wyant
Yates

Yon

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 15712), making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, finding itself without a quorum, the roll was called, and he submitted a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill H. R. 15712, reports that that committee, finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, whereupon 246 Members answered to their names—a quorum. The names of the absentees will appear in the Journal. The committee will resume its session.

Thereupon the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union resumed its session, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the management of the affairs of our Government is perhaps the biggest business enterprise in existence. It is difficult even for those of us intrusted with its management to know very much about it; hence it is not strange that the public is unconcerned and disposed to let it drift along. The attitude of the public is not very different from ours—we try to know something about those matters in which we have a special interest, while we ignore or permit others to attend to the rest.

The War Department is big; in fact, it is an enormous project. The work is supposed to be difficult and highly specialized, and all of us are disposed to let Army officers formulate the policies for us to blindly follow, assuming that what is done is right, and that we should never set our opinions against those experts in such matters.

I am convinced that we have been following dangerous lines and that the time has come for us to inquire diligently into these programs and the proposals of these men, then we can dictate legislative procedure uninfluenced by sentiment or the glitter of brass buttons. In this land of ours it is the duty of civilians to outline the military policy of their Government and to completely dominate its military activities.

I shall try to point out to you some of the salient features of this bill—to do more than to scratch the surface of this gigantic task would be impossible here this afternoon.

The activities of the War Department can well be considered under six subdivisions:

First. The Regular Army.

Second. The Militia Bureau, or, more correctly speaking, the federalized National Guard.

Third. The Organized Reserves.

Fourth. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Fifth. The citizens' military training camps.

Sixth. The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice.

The last five are civilian organizations. However, officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army are in direct charge of their operation and management, 3,089 officers and 24,019 enlisted men being assigned to these organizations for their training and instruction.

The Regular Army is, of course, growing not only in officers and enlisted men but in civilian personnel as well. The five civilian military organizations are likewise growing and are becoming more and more effective, especially from a political standpoint, and their political influence and power is growing in proportion to their growth in numbers. Numerically, they are larger and more effective now than they have ever been, and next year they will be larger and more effective than they are to-day. Their political influence and power, too, will grow with their ever-increasing numbers and their wishes will be more and more respected by public officials generally and especially those of us in Congress.

The creation of another division called the munitions unit was proposed in the 1929 bill; Congress authorized its creation in an act passed June 8, 1926, but this subcommittee, however, saw fit to prevent its beginning in 1929 and under that particular name it does not appear in this bill. The purpose of this unit was to take young men after graduation from college and give them 3 months' training in the Regular Army, then send them to college for 9 months and after this to put them in the factories of the country for 6 months, giving in all 18 months'

specialized training in factory work and management, and in the event of hostilities these men would become officers and would take charge of the factories of our country and operate them under the supervision of the Regular Army. It was proposed to begin with 250 such students and later to bring them up to 400 and thence to a larger figure. The law says that one-half of 1 per cent of the enlisted strength of the Army and 2 per cent of officers can be trained annually, and with our Regular Army establishment at its present size, this would provide approximately 840 students to be trained annually and with the retirement figure at 64 years, it would be possible to have about 34,500 such officers. Of course, this figure is the outstanding one and should be reduced by one-half on account of deaths, resignations, and other causes, but even with 17,250 such officers, its size and expense would be enormous. This scheme has never been tried out. No country has it now or has undertaken it. The student trained may or may not follow the work for which he was specially trained. If he did not, his training was wasted. If he did pursue the work for which he was trained, it would be foolish to let him contract with himself in the purchase of supplies for the Government or to permit him to adopt work standards, with the War Department backing him in his every whim. Aside from this, it is a dangerous undertaking in a republic to put its factories, including management and men, under the control of the Military Establishment.

Notwithstanding the action of the committee in failing to provide by name for this unit, the same activity by a different name appears in this bill; and while there also appears a provision keeping its size down to what it is now, as time goes on it will nevertheless grow year after year, and the Congress should bestir itself for the purpose of destroying it now while it is young. It is termed "procurement." Officers of the Regular Army, as well as officers in the civilian military organizations, are assigned to this work; they have offices rented in the various cities of the United States with competent civilian personnel all paid for out of funds appropriated in this bill, and these officers are supposed to keep in touch with the factories, fields, and transportation systems so that in the event of war or an emergency they can take charge of them and operate them, as they perhaps think, very much better and with a greater degree of patriotism than their civilian owners—all of which, however, I very much doubt. My own ideas are that those in charge of our fields, factories, and transportation systems understand the problems confronting them very much better than outsiders, even though these outsiders be Army officers. They have always shown a willingness to respond to all calls made upon them by their country and I sincerely believe that they can be trusted in the future to provide food, transportation, clothing, and implements of warfare better if left alone. Imagine some second lieutenant telling Mr. Ford how to run his factory either in peace or in war time, or some first lieutenant telling Mr. Atterbury how to run the Pennsylvania Railroad, or some captain telling the farmers of the country how they can best secure a larger number of bushels of wheat on a given number of acres of land. It is the rankest nonsense. The Army has tried to conduct strictly civilian activities in the past in other countries and their efforts have always been failures. They are not trained for this work and are incompetent to perform it. Success in any line requires the constant study of those in charge and their duties should not be interfered with by meddlers foisted on them by the Government under the pretext of national defense.

The enlisted strength of the Regular Army is 118,750 men. The officers number 12,000; however, the bill, as it came to this subcommittee, carried 12,200. The Philippine Scouts had last year a strength of 6,060. This bill provides for 6,500. The Army has 1,157 warrant officers; there are 148 retired officers on active duty; and a large number of these are in high schools scattered throughout the country teaching little boys to "play at war" and likewise trying to popularize the military idea.

There are about 60,000 civilians provided for in this bill assigned to various activities of the Army. It is impossible to find out just exactly their number, but they will aggregate about 60,000 and they will gradually increase. Their salaries compare favorably with men in similar lines of work in civilian life and hence they are superior as military workmen and as military experts to enlisted men. Their presence makes the Army much more effective than it would be by the addition of a similar number of enlisted men, and also relieves officers and men of much onerous work that they would otherwise have to do and in turn gives them more time for pleasure and amusement and general recreation. The officers of all classes number 13,305, and the enlisted men, including Philippine Scouts, are 125,250, and to these should be added experts, mechanics of all kinds, and other civilians performing all sorts of work, the

total of these being about 60,000, giving the Regular Army a total strength of about 198,555.

The officer and enlisted strength provided for in this bill is larger than it was in 1929. It was about 5,000 greater in 1929 than it was in 1926 and 1927. While this bill shows an officer and enlisted strength of only 365 more men than were provided for in the 1929 bill, the cost of the Regular Army is very much more than the cost provided for in the 1929 act. This cost year after year will show larger increases. The pay of the 12,000 officers in this bill will be around three and a half million dollars more than that provided in the 1929 act. All branches of the Regular Army are abundantly provided for. The Air Corps alone is given \$33,578,683 as against a total appropriation for 1929 of \$25,875,041. The figure \$33,578,683 does not, however, represent the cost of the Air Corps. Its real cost is \$66,336,002. As evidence of the fact that this appropriation is more than sufficient, I call the attention of the Congress to the following statement of General Summerall when asked about its adequacy:

It is a well-balanced program, and we feel in many ways it is quite generous.

The Militia Bureau of the federalized National Guard continues to grow. In 1920 it had 1,939 officers and 47,019 enlisted men; on June 30, 1927, there were 12,010 officers and 182 warrant officers and 168,750 enlisted men—a total of 180,920 men. There was carried in the 1929 bill an appropriation sufficient to take this number to 188,000, of whom 13,630 are officers. This bill carries an appropriation sufficient to provide for 190,000 men, of whom 13,966 are officers. Those in charge of the Militia Bureau testify that their immediate program will seek a total aggregate strength of 210,521 National Guard troops. After this number is reached, then the goal will be 435,000, for that is the number authorized in the national defense act. Regular Army officers and federalized National Guard officers are quite enthusiastic over making the National Guard a thoroughly efficient organization. They are anxious for it to grow and to become more effective and are quite solicitous about every subject pertaining to its welfare, and have thus far been able to secure practically everything that their hearts might desire.

This bill provides for 48 drills a year and 15 days' intensive training at camp. Of course, officers and men attending these drills and taking this intensive training are paid for doing so. There are quite a number of members of the guard, both officers and men, who have a yearly status and are paid according to their grade. The training of the guard is practically the same as that of the Regular Army; it is organized according to the same lines, and it has cavalry, field artillery, an air corps, tank corps, an engineers' unit, a chemical warfare section, an observation section, and practically everything else that the Regular Army has. Two hundred and sixty-three of its officers and 110 of its enlisted men go to service schools and are there given special training by officers in the Regular Army. The amount provided for this schooling totals approximately \$375,000. Guard affairs generally and instruction of its officers and men are under Regular Army officers and enlisted men; 447 officers and 589 noncommissioned officers are especially detailed for their training and instruction.

Of course, it has to have plenty of horses for its several branches, the same as the Regular Army, including its air corps, for horseback riding is becoming more and more popular as a social activity, and an ample number of horses must be provided for those in the federalized National Guard who are anxious to ride. On December 1, 1928, it had 10,299 horses; of this number 8,389 were Government-owned and 1,910 were State-owned, which had been federally accepted and were maintained at Federal expense. This number does not include the ones provided in the 1929 bill.

It has 19 organized air squadrons, with 347 officers and 1,689 men. They each averaged 91.56 flying hours. Pilots in the Regular Army average around 200 hours a year. They are up to full strength in all classes of planes. This bill provides for the purchase of 22 additional planes. It has its various units, including harbor defense, antiaircraft artillery; in fact, almost every kind of modern equipment, such as ambulances, tractors, trucks, searchlights, and so forth. The motorized vehicles number 5,795.

The federalized guard during the past four years has cost the Government some \$55,000,000 per year. This bill carries \$32,319,798, and after State contributions and free issues are added the cost will be around \$55,000,000—perhaps more.

The per capita cost of the members of the federalized guard to the Federal Government is \$222.55 and to the States \$87.31—a total of \$309.86—and these figures do not include all of the

items that should be properly charged against the guard. The total value of equipment in the guard as of June 30, 1928, is \$111,973,941.49. The real per capita cost of members of the guard to the Federal Government and State governments is around \$500 per year.

The Organized Reserves have grown to be largely an officer organization. There is a branch for enlisted men, but there are very few in it. The Organized Reserves is the result of the national defense act. It is growing very rapidly and will continue to grow, and there is no limit upon its possible growth. The members of this subcommittee have repeatedly requested the War Department to furnish information as to those in the Organized Reserves who are showing an interest in it, but there seems to be a disposition in the department to let well enough alone; and if a person becomes a member of the Organized Reserves, whether he performs any duty or not he will always continue to be an officer in it, and I am confident that this policy will continue. On June 30, 1920, it had 68,232 officers and no enlisted men. On June 30, 1926, it had 103,829 officers and 5,775 enlisted men. On June 30, 1927, it had 110,014 officers and 5,735 enlisted men. On June 30, 1928, it had 114,824 commissioned officers and 5,416 enlisted men. Of these officers 20,000 are provided 15 days' training out of funds appropriated in this bill. Four hundred and fifty-four officers will be given more than 15 days' training. This subcommittee increased the number to be trained over that recommended by the Budget. This bill provides for the training of 130 Air Corps officers, who will receive one year's instruction. This number will increase year after year until 330 are annually trained, and shortly afterwards this number will go to 550 per year. These reserve officers are also given correspondence course, or, in other words, such of them as are willing to take these courses, and under this practice certain military instruction is provided.

This particular activity is divided into various units and sections, the same as the Regular Army and the federalized guard, with war implements of the same or similar kinds. They have Regular Army officers totaling 416 and 501 enlisted men over them who are assigned for their training and officer management. The officers in the Organized Reserves were officers to start with, and it is wholly unnecessary to furnish them with intensive training at all times; however, every effort is made to keep them abreast with the times and to provide them with modern military instruction.

The Organized Reserves is growing just like all of the other branches of the Army. In 1920 the number of officers was around 68,000, and it stayed around this figure for about one year; then, in 1923, it was 70,000; 1924, 81,000; 1925, 95,000; 1926, 103,000; 1927, 110,000; 1928, 114,824. The immediate goal for the Organized Reserves is 125,000, and this will be reached in a very short while in spite of the fact that it was decided last year that only 65,833 of these officers could possibly be used in the mobilization of three and a half million men. One-tenth of the officers of the Organized Reserves going to camp are used in procurement.

The word "procurement" as used by the Army in this connection does not mean procurement; it merely means that these 2,000 men are given training under military officers in farm management, transportation management, factory management, and, in fact, the management of practically all civilian activities so that in the event of war or a great emergency the production of food and the manufacture of clothing, medicine, and in fact everything that could be used by human beings or an Army, as well as transportation facilities, would be under the control and dictation of Army officers. The amount carried in this bill for the Organized Reserves is \$5,757,879. Of course, this item covers only the general activities of the Organized Reserves.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps is made up of young men in the colleges and the high schools of the country and there are 127,141 of these young men who will take toll out of this bill; those in the colleges are divided into two classes: The advanced students and the basic students. There are 13,870 of the advanced students and 71,250 of the basic students. Those little boys in the high schools of the country who are given military instruction are known as junior students and they number 42,021. In addition to these, there are 59 schools with an enrollment of 14,807 that are known as 55-C schools. They do not properly belong to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; they are given infantry training mostly and are provided with rifles and ammunition and certain other allowances. I can not give the Congress the number of girls who are given this particular training because their number was not furnished to the committee, but usually pretty girls are chosen as officers and sponsors and uniforms are provided for them. These girl offi-

cers are frequently installed with much pomp and ceremony and public display; they lead parades and participate in reviews and preside on social occasions, conduct personal inspection of boy cadets in some places, and act as general billboards advertising the glory of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the military machinery.

The Boston Post carried this story of how these little ladies are made useful:

Four girls of the New Bedford High School have been elected officers in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the New Bedford High School, and their commissions have been authorized by the War Department. * * * The girl officer, according to modern training ideas, furnishes a liaison between the social and military life of the school. The girl officer is expected to call the attention of the boy in training to the fact that a button may be missing from his tunic or that a grease spot may have appeared at his elbow. The reserve officer, it is believed, would more readily accept criticism from a girl than he would from a boy, and be more anxious to avoid it. The same idea prompts the training officer to have the girls accompany them on tours of inspection. * * * The "lady officers" are known as sponsors and are elected by the student body. Thus the most popular girls in the school are officially recognized in the Army organization.

I have a picture of 11 pretty little girls from the Ogden, Utah, high schools, all dressed in special military uniform. Under the photo is this quotation:

Always filled are the ranks of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Ogden. The photo shows the reason.

I have also a press clipping showing Major General Summerrail with a pretty girl from Creighton University, in Omaha. The general is quoted as saying:

With so pretty a colonel, it is no wonder the Creighton Reserve Officers' Training Corps is such a well-drilled unit.

According to the San Diego Union, they have gone one step further out there and have a corps of matron sponsors as well as pretty girl sponsors to help popularize their military unit. The military minded are out to get the whole family to boost their idea. In turn for the publicity and popularity the girls give the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, they get much social distinction and no end of newspaper publicity, their pictures appearing in scores and scores of newspapers from coast to coast. As many as 50 to 75 pictures of many of these girls are published by as many different city newspapers. Of course, the youngsters fall for this, as do their mothers, brothers, sisters. It is the old game of playing sex appeal on youngsters for the purpose of helping to popularize this activity of "playing at war."

The girls have rifle teams, and they like it; and, of course, it does not cost them anything. It helps to make them popular, and they join in the game. So many of these trainings units are so well supplied with officers and men that they have time to coach these teams on the side—as a delight to themselves, to the girls, and to the community. The press is filled with pictures of these fair marksmen. I have a clipping that tells the story of one who became so enthusiastic over her work that she actually enrolled in the military unit at her university and took the training. She was made an honorary colonel for her interest. The press reports her as studying infantry drill, musketry, and automatic-rifle shooting. The fact that these news stories with photographs of pretty girls go out over the country all the time is another factor to keep in mind when trying to estimate the future influence of this program. We pay officers to train men for battle, and they spend their time playing around with co-ed marksmen and Government equipment is used by many of these teams, and the Government supplies the ammunition.

The big parade for boy cadets where girl officers turn out to "strut their stuff" is becoming a community event in many places and, of course, the Regular Army is glad to pull off these events, since it gives them opportunities to make speeches on the glories of preparedness and the general stupidity of our country in the past. You should see some of these gala parades and reviews held by our civilian training units—for the edification of those in the ranks and those in the grand stands. Just listen to this press description of a review in a western high school taken from the San Diego Union of January 24, 1928:

The battalion and company officers were ordered "front and center," to be confronted by a line of girls equal in number to the cadet officers. There was an instant of salute, and each officer claimed his sponsor and proudly lead her to his unit, where she took her place with as much precision as her escort. The companies and battalions greeted their sponsors with a round of applause.

Some of the newspaper headlines run:

Fifteen thousand at Gloucester High School battalions field day. Pretty sponsors spur boys in annual Reserve Officers' Training Corps field day. Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit struts stuff in annual review—

And so forth.

These parades and reviews are made so thrilling and attractive by every means possible that the little tots of the community will look forward to the time when they get big enough to participate in yet bigger and showier parades.

The young ladies are not the only agencies used in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for the purpose of popularizing military training. Horses also play a large part. There are certain schools that would probably not have a Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit were it not for the riding horses that are provided for the amusement of these young men. Riding is becoming very popular socially, and most young men in schools like to ride, and as long as they are able to ride a good horse, furnished, fed, and equipped in a fine, splendid way by the United States Government, they join the Reserve Officers' Training Corps—for the purpose of improving their horsemanship. Nearly 2,000 horses are furnished now by the Government to various educational institutions, and additional ones were provided for in the 1929 bill and still more in this bill. The Government has 13 mules assigned to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. I do not know whether there is any special significance in the number 13 or not, but I do know there is a dearth of mules. I presume that they are used for zoological purposes.

So you see we can now add to the saying, "Join the Army and become a man," "Join the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and ride." The horse is kept in the Army because of its amusement and social value rather than its probable military usefulness.

In order to further popularize this work the drilling is reduced to a very low minimum. Three hours per week constitute the entire time that is required of a young man, and of this time not over one-third is devoted to drills. The rest of the time is taken up with such work as organization and administration, military customs, military courtesy, military hygiene, first aid, marksmanship, physical training, command, leadership, military sketching, map reading, military law, patriotism, the beauties of the national defense act, and such other kindred subjects. Bayonet practice has been abolished because it did not have a very favorable appeal to young men and young women engaged in this training, and it was thought that it was tending to make the work less attractive and popular. Band instruments are likewise provided by the Government, so that these young men and young women may be supplied with music at Federal expense, and, of course, hostesses are furnished in the camps, so as to wet-nurse these youngsters and direct them along the proper social lines. There are other things too numerous to mention furnished and provided these young people so as to popularize the training.

These young men in the colleges are given subsistence allowance at school and are provided with uniforms. And, of course, the military uniform has always been one of the prize inducements for persuading young men and women that military service was glorious. The advanced course students are provided with a uniform costing \$30 and allowed \$6 the second year for its renovation. The junior and basic units are provided with a less expensive uniform, but with this bill the uniform allowance for the juniors will be increased, and in a very short while the juniors will be given a uniform costing around \$20 per man. I have not been able to learn how the uniforms for the young ladies are furnished, but I presume it is taken care of somewhere in the bill.

And, mind you, the Regular Army officers say they need a new uniform for the soldiers of the country, the enlisted men in the Regular Army. Those men who will stand the brunt of the battle in the event of war. They can not afford to ask us to give these men a new uniform, but they are asking for one for these youngsters in the colleges of the country.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps is divided into the Infantry, the Cavalry, the Field Artillery, the Coast Artillery, the Air Corps, Engineers, Signal Corps, and other corps units in the same manner as the Regular Army. They have allotted to them for their training and education 700 Regular Army officers, 108 active retired Army officers, 18 warrant officers, 495 noncommissioned officers, 27 active retired noncommissioned officers, and 407 enlisted men, over 1,750 Army men in all. I do not remember now the number of hostesses.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COLLINS. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. It is my recollection that the War Department did not want rifle matches except every few years, and Congress itself passed a law requiring that they shall be annual affairs.

Mr. COLLINS. That is so.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I know I opposed the passage of the bill at the time, but my opposition was ineffective.

Mr. COLLINS. Only 27 of the teams will go to the rifle matches.

Most of these young men are youngsters of tender years and, of course, those in the high schools are very young and their minds are in a formative state.

Military training is compulsory in about 85 colleges and universities, but is elective in about 45. In the high schools it is compulsory in about 20 cities and elective in about 35. In the 55-C schools, which are in addition to those just named, I have no information as to whether training is elective or compulsory.

This military training is acceptable to the management of many schools and colleges because it provides subsistence and uniform allowance to students, as well as the so-called physical training and citizenship training at Federal Government expense, and further because of the fact that other work like horseback riding, and so forth, that most young men like to indulge in is furnished them free.

The amount carried for this activity is \$2,676,817, but this by no means covers the entire expense of this activity. It really does not even begin to take care of it.

Citizens' military training camps are intended to take care of the training of citizens generally along military lines. It is intended to train at these camps young men from all the walks of civil life who would like to go to camp for 30 days where military instruction is provided them. They are usually trained at Regular Army camps; 34,515 were trained this year. This bill provides for the training of 37,500, an increase of about 3,000 over the number last trained.

All kinds of advertising campaigns are carried on to secure these trainees. Moving-picture films are used, and posters and leaflets, advertising buttons, window cards, street-car cards, and bus cards are used to induce young men to go to summer training camps. The Post Office Department uses a stamp on the face of letters for the purpose of advertising this activity. Of course, other forms of advertising are also used, and then there are Army officers and enlisted men stationed over the country for the purpose of persuading the heads of big corporations to permit young men working for them to attend these summer camps.

These young men at camp are also provided with hostesses to look after their social activities. They are also given numerous kinds of amusement, including horses to ride, and other methods calculated to popularize the work. This particular activity, like all the rest of them, will grow, and those having it in charge ultimately hope to train at least 100,000 of these young men annually.

At camp these boys are provided with the usual uniform—a cravat, raincoat, shirts, gymnasium shoes, one or two pairs of service shoes, and such other articles as they might need for training and the amusements furnished them. Fourteen hundred Regular Army officers and 22,000 enlisted men and a number of hostesses are provided by the Government to look after and train these young men while they are at camp for 30 days.

This organization is also instructed in the work of factory management, railroad management, farm management, and other civilian activities, so that they may be used in the general scheme of taking over the management of farms, transportation systems, and manufacturing concerns in the event of war or national emergency. This work is called "procurement," too, and has been discussed heretofore. For this activity \$2,742,158 is appropriated, but this amount is small as compared with the total cost of the work.

Rifle matches are also provided for in this bill. This is now a yearly activity. The amount of \$734,750 is appropriated to carry on this work, but this figure also does not tell the whole story, for there are a great many articles furnished to these men which are not included in this figure; neither does it take care of the salaries and other general expenses of Army officers who are assigned to this particular duty.

This bill provides for 27 civilian teams of 10 men each, or 270 civilians that will go to the annual matches. The different branches of the Regular Army will send teams too, also the various civilian military organizations, including the schools. The Navy will likewise send its teams there. Of course, the rifle clubs throughout the country are furnished with ammunition and guns, and there are several thousand such teams; but only 27 of the teams will go to the annual rifle matches. There are a number of these teams that are made up of ladies. Not

only the young ladies in the schools have rifle teams, but also ladies throughout the country belong to rifle teams and some of them go to these matches. Civilians belonging to these teams are usually men of mature years, some of them range in age between 60 and 70 years.

From the statements I have made it will be seen that we are carrying on a very elaborate program in training our men and women for military duty, and we are spending a great deal of money in popularizing the military idea. The total number in all of these military establishments, including the Regular Army, is about 700,000, and constitutes an army very much bigger than the average citizen realizes. Of course, it must be admitted that many of these citizens' military trainees are encouraged to be in these units by Regular Army management for propaganda purposes only. They are given sugar-coated training because they will become boosters of the war-game idea. Whatever their purpose in being in these organizations does not matter; we are confronted with the stern reality that there exists in the United States a military establishment numbering around 700,000 persons, and that it is growing rapidly year by year, and that it has the lawful, regular, legislative, authorized authority to grow. It is evident also that the time is near at hand when it will approach the million mark, and then the 2,000,000 mark will be close at hand, and when it reaches 1,000,000, Members of Congress who stand in its way will be retired to private life; then we will find ourselves in the attitude of humbly obeying commands that will be sternly given us. I think it is high time that we see conditions as they really exist, and while we are free we should curb this growing menace.

Just what is our military department looking forward to in the way of an expansion program? In a little book by Lieut. Col. P. S. Bond we have an outline of what he believes would constitute a proper military policy. I take it that this proposal of Colonel Bond is suggestive of what our War Department is driving at because his works are very widely used by the War Department in the training of our young men throughout the country.

Let us look at his proposed military program:

1. A Regular Army of about 300,000 enlisted men and 20,000 officers, etc.
2. A National Guard under complete Federal control, numbering from 400,000 to 500,000 officers and men.
3. An Organized Reserve of from 500,000 to 1,000,000 officers and men, etc.
4. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps in schools and colleges.
5. Universal military training for young men in time of peace.
6. Summer camps of instruction (nine in addition to universal training camps) for—
 - a. Regular Army.
 - b. National Guard.
 - c. Organized Reserves, etc.
7. Uniform organization training and equipment for all branches of the military forces.
8. Compulsory service, both military and industrial, in time of war.
9. Enlistments to six months beyond the cessation of hostilities for all wars.
10. Appointment of all officers by Federal authority.
11. Use of Regular officers in the higher command and staff positions with National Guard and reserve troops in time of war, etc.
12. A proper equipment for all troops, and a proper reserve of equipment and all necessary supplies, etc.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COLLINS. Certainly.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Who is that from whom the gentleman has been quoting?

Mr. COLLINS. Lieut. Col. P. S. Bond. He is a gentleman who writes articles and books for the schools and colleges of the country engaged in this training.

This colorful program is enlightening, for it reveals the real meaning beneath the endeavors of those who are trying to boost the Military Establishment and to popularize it. This is what they are looking forward to. The methods of embellishing the military game I have outlined above are a part of the means for making us willing to swallow this whole scheme without gulping too much as it goes down. Of course, this Congress and the country at large would not accept any such proposition if it were all presented to us at once—but when it comes in small doses, all wrapped up in pretty bundles of colorful display and charmed public sentiment, we are more inclined to take it.

Let me throw light upon the methods they are using to get us back of this scheme.

First. In the first place there is the practice of presenting military training and military life as training in citizenship, physical education, and character development. Parents are told to send their boys to the citizens' military training camps and to Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in the schools and colleges to make men of them. Quite often very little is said about preparation for national defense and little effort is made to develop the spirit of really being ready to face the crucial tests of actual warfare. Rather the summer vacation side of the camps or the personal advantages to be gained from the training units are stressed. After a boy has enrolled in one of these civilian training agencies because of these appeals to his personal desires he is told that what he is doing is the highest form of patriotism and that he is being made the very best kind of man and citizen.

Schools and colleges that are pressed for funds for maintaining courses in physical training and courses in citizenship are willing to pass the buck to the Federal Government and accept military training and military instructors in the place of civilian teachers especially prepared to teach these subjects.

The result of this is that military men are set up as experts in physical education, in citizenship, and in character development. Boys and girls are given the impression that good citizenship and good character consist of the ways and attitudes of the military man. Since military training is extolled above other forms of training for these same ends, boys and girls get the idea that there is no other class so well fitted to lead youth as the military group, no other service so patriotic as military service.

If you will drop into the post office in this city down near the Pennsylvania Station you will see a poster of a man in military uniform rushing over a hilltop with his rifle and bayonet in position to thrust, while behind him the flag flutters in the breeze. At the top of the poster is the heading, "United States marines." Underneath this highly colored figure is the statement in large letters, "A man's game," the idea being that the military game is the only man's game.

Members of the reserve who are out in the business and industrial world succeed in getting civilian support and money to help out the extensive military appropriations carried in this bill for further garnishing the military life. Funds for prizes and awards to members of various units are secured and these awards are granted before large audiences of admiring parents and neighbors. One of our large universities, for example—the University of Illinois—carries in its annual catalogue the announcement of five medals or prizes to be given to the boys who most enthusiastically enter into the war game.

Magazines published through civilian money singing the praises of the War Department program are widely circulated through the country. At least in one case, that is in the second largest city in the country—in the Chicago High School Reserve Officers' Training Corps units—they are given to all boys taking training. Bulletins and magazines published by branches of the service, and carried under the War Department official business postal frank, carry propaganda for a blatant militarism and ridicule efforts to find substitutes for the military way of doing business.

These magazines are published by certain branches of the Army, are paid for by the United States Government, and go out under frank. In the December issue of one of the bulletins of one of the branches of the service, for example, they departed so far from their regular business of military preparedness to carry an attack upon "labor colleges," hinting that all such were attempts to undermine the Government. I do not know anything about labor colleges. I am not their defender. I only know that Government funds should not be spent in this way. Just what is the philosophy that is being sold to the country through these moves to popularize the Military Establishment? Let us look at some of the public utterances of our military representatives. Major General Hinds is reported in the press—Rocky Mountain News, Denver, November 18, 1927—to have said to the students of the Denver High School:

There will be another war just as sure as the sun rises in the east.

General Ely, commandant of the Second Corps Area, speaking before the Exchange Club of New York City, is reported in the New York Times—October 12, 1928—to have said:

We all know there will be a next war, despite talk of peace pacts. * * * We can get around these disarmament pacts and be prepared for the next war only if we adopt some sort of a program of industrial preparedness.

Major McNair, of the Purdue University Reserve Officers' Training Corps, said in the Purdue Alumnus of May 3, 1926:

If a pacifist is one who believes that war is unnecessary and preventable, then pacifism becomes a menace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed one hour.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Lieut. Col. P. S. Bond, who is the author or editor of a number of training manuals used by our civilian military training units and whose military dream I have just read to you, says in his booklet, *Our Military Policy*, which is used by many college units:

We live in a world governed by Divine laws which we can neither alter nor evade. And in this world of ours force is the ultimate power.

Now, one does not have to be a pacifist to feel that the effect over a period of years of this playing around with our boys and girls of men who hold this military philosophy of ever-recurring wars and big preparedness for peace will be a constant growth of that sentiment in the land. At a time when our country is trying along with other lands to find some substitute for war we go on laying the foundations for an ever-increasing military machine.

This appropriation provides for some 700,000 men, an establishment as large as any possessed by any other nation. Many of these are having a most delightful experience and are most happy to be a part of this giant army. They will attract others to desire the same experience. We may expect down through the years to see the demands made upon this Congress grow until our Military Establishment reaches further and further into the life of our people. This is only a beginning if we are to judge by the evidences I have given of the efforts made to extend the popularity of our war establishment.

We are being made to work for this goal—not knowingly, for we do not seem to know what we are doing. Gradually, but faster than we realize, we are lead, as those mesmerized, and without knowing the result of our conduct. This applies with equal truth to the general public who are carried away with this popularizing, this playing at the only man's game, and to those of us who vote year after year for these growing appropriations.

Are we not proceeding along ways proven wrong? Are we not laying the foundations for future trouble? Can we carry on as we are going to-day without provoking our neighbors to follow after us, and will not the day of reckoning come to us as it has to others? We complain of the military and naval preparedness of our sister nations, while at the same time we are lulling ourselves into the stupid notion that our conduct is different from theirs. Fellow Members, is it not about time to correctly interpret our own actions? We are fooling no one but ourselves. [Applause.]

Mr. ADKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. ADKINS. Did the gentleman vote to recommend this elaborate scheme to the House?

Mr. COLLINS. I did not. [Applause.]

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman put in the *RECORD* the names of the magazines published by the War Department and sent out under frank?

Mr. COLLINS. I will say to the gentleman that later on I hope to make a speech on magazines in the War Department.

Mr. JAMES. I read the hearings, but could not find any, so I would like to have the gentleman give me the names of the magazines published by the Army or any branch of the Army and sent out under frank.

Mr. COLLINS. I have an armful of them over in my office, and if the gentleman wants to look at them he can do so.

Mr. JAMES. I do not want to look at them, but I would like to have the gentleman put the names of the magazines in the *RECORD* so we can all know about them.

Mr. COLLINS. As I said, I hope to make a speech later on on the subject of magazines in the Army.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has attacked the entire system of national defense as now proposed by law. Has the gentleman any plan to suggest other than that we now have, and has he any suggestion to make as to how we should defend ourselves in this country?

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is just raking straw now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I am not raking straw; I am asking seriously.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is not asking a question to elicit information, but I will ask the gentleman whether he approves of all these activities enumerated by me.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I approve of an adequate national defense, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS. I am not asking the gentleman if he believes in adequate national defense; I am asking him if he believes in this playing at the war game. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I did not mean to offend the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS. I know the purpose the gentleman has in the back of his head.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has attacked the entire War Department, as I understand.

Mr. COLLINS. I have not done anything of the kind.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the way I understood the gentleman's speech.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is still raking straw. The gentleman is joining the army of propagandists; that is what he is doing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I am not raking straw.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is getting in on it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I am not raking straw; I am just asking the gentleman a polite question, but if he does not care to answer it, all right.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is just joining the rest of these propaganda agents.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman stated he did not vote to report this appropriation bill to the House. Is the gentleman going to offer amendments as we progress under the 5-minute rule to cure the situation which he has been condemning?

Mr. COLLINS. I hope to offer some amendments, but I am rather inclined to believe, from my experience last year, that my amendments will not be accepted. I will try some of them, though.

Mr. ADKINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ADKINS. The purpose I had in mind in asking my question was to ascertain whether the ideas the gentleman has so ably presented in his speech were given to the committee and how the gentleman's committee took the suggestions he has made here. Has the gentleman presented those matters to the committee?

Mr. COLLINS. I will say this to the gentleman in defense of the committee: This committee cut out a lot of very useless items; in fact, the committee deserves the congratulations of this House for the elimination of many items that I think should have been eliminated. The trouble about most of the activities that I have criticized is that ample law exists for their continuance. The national defense act was passed at the immediate close of the war, when men were excited and had all sorts of notions about preparedness, all sorts of ideas about what was going to happen to us in the future and taking advantage of this situation this act was jammed through Congress. The national defense act permits almost anything to be done by the War Department. If it were proposed to-day, it would not get 25 votes.

Mr. ADKINS. The thought I had in mind was whether or not the matter was presented to the committee and whether the committee had this idea of militarizing the minds of our country.

Mr. COLLINS. Ours is not a legislative committee anyway but is an appropriation committee, and if we propose legislation, points of order would be made against it and such proposed legislation would go out of the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

If there is no further debate, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Chief of Engineers, \$121,858: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers, to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors, surveys, and preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor estimates and bills, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1930 shall not exceed \$191,620; the Secretary of War shall each year, in the Budget, report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, it was not my intention nor purpose to have anything to say on this occasion, but in view of the colloquy between the distinguished gentleman who has just preceded me, Mr. COLLINS, of Mississippi, a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and myself, I think

it is due me, and particularly in view of the manner in which the gentleman answered my question, it is due the House that I should make a brief statement of my ideas on the question of national defense.

If I interpreted the gentleman's speech that he made here, it was a very general attack upon our laws of preparedness in this country, which are incorporated in the national defense act, without suggesting or setting up in his speech any method for the defense of the country or any procedure for us to follow in times of peace.

Seriously, I think the gentleman has made a speech here which very seriously attacks our entire national-defense system. For one, I am not in favor of a large standing Army or a large Navy, but I do not think this country is justified even in peace times in going along without some plan of defense for our people.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER. Especially when the other nations of the world are increasing their appropriations for armies and navies and air forces.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman is correct; and I want to say in passing I think this bill that is now before the House is certainly as free of partisanship as any appropriation bill I have ever had occasion to study; and I want to say further that this Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has been very liberal to the people of the section of the country that I in part have the honor to represent.

Now, take the National Guard, the Officers' Training Corps, and the citizens' military training camps, and the various school military activities, and especially take the training camps that we have every year in various sections of the country, I do not see anything in these activities that is undermining the foundations of our Government. I do not see anything wrong with them, and I confess, in all seriousness, I do not think the gentleman was justified in saying that I was "just raking straw," whatever he means by that term. I think the gentleman is not even raking straw. I think he is doing worse than that. I think he is attacking a great legislative program and is attacking the national-defense system of our country. That is the way I feel about it.

I did not intend to say anything at this time on the bill, but for one I believe in an adequate defense, and in respect to our Army and our Navy, they should be sufficiently large in peace time that in case of war we can build up a sufficient Army and Navy for our defense. I think wherever our flag flies we ought to spend enough money and have enough men to protect American lives and property. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

In expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended (U. S. C., pp. 65-71, secs. 661-673, 45 Stat. 776-785), the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the classification act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment. On page 4, line 4, strike out "pp. 65-71" and insert in lieu thereof "title 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: On page 4, line 4, within the parenthesis, strike out "pp. 65-71" and insert "title 5."

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman's amendment leaves in the letters "U. S. C."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that all through the bill reference is made to the United States Code by pages and sections. It so happens that just now there is but one print of the United States Code and the page reference may be correct, but the proper method of referring to the United States Code is by title and section. It is not necessary to refer to the chapter because the sections run consecutively within the title.

Now, it may so happen that the copy of the laws that you refer to in the departments or elsewhere may be in pamphlet form or there may be other editions and therefore your page reference is of no value.

Mr. BARBOUR. Does not the gentleman think, though, that this is a more convenient reference, because your title may cover a great many pages, and if you simply refer to the title then you have to turn to each page?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; because you have the reference to the section. It is dangerous to refer to pages because all the editions of the law are not the same. A page reference is only useful assuming every one has the same edition of the law, and inasmuch as the print we have before us will change next year, if we add the laws that have passed this year, then your page reference is not of any value even with respect to the edition now in use; and there is a rule now before the House that references to the code must be made according to title and section.

Mr. BARBOUR. Our only object is to make the reference as convenient as possible so that the law can be readily turned to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly. A great many officials who are handling these matters in all likelihood have not the United States Code before them, but they will have the title and the section of the code which is referred to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Of course, this bill is only an annual appropriation bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly; but it is good parliamentary practice to have uniform references, and that is what we are trying to get.

Mr. BARBOUR. The citations are carried in this way all through the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I know that.

Mr. BARBOUR. They ought to be uniform.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They ought to be uniform. I can correct them as far as we go to-day and I think to-morrow, by the time we take up the bill again, the gentleman ought to be prepared to have the clerk of the committee prepare them.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman wants us to prepare them?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not care who does it, but it is something that ought to be done.

Mr. BARBOUR. We might ask unanimous consent to have all the references uniform.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That would be fine. I think if this amendment is approved of, if the chairman of the subcommittee would ask unanimous consent that where references to pages appear the title shall be inserted, then that can be done as a matter of mechanics.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in each place in the bill where the citation "U. S. C." appears the page references be stricken out and the proper title references be inserted, so that the citations will be uniform in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the same amendment may be made wherever this same language appears in the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

When specifically approved by the Secretary of War, transfers may be made between the appropriations in this act under the respective jurisdiction of any bureau, office, corps, or branch, in order to meet increases in compensation resulting from the reallocation by the Personnel Classification Board of positions under any such organization unit. Any such transfers shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from California, Was this paragraph inserted to meet the situation created by the interpretation by the Comptroller General of the Welch Act?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; this is to take care of a situation that exists this year to which this bill applies. It is carried in all the appropriation bills this year.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The same phraseology was inserted in the preceding appropriation bills?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I understood in the colloquy between the chairman of one of the appropriation subcommittees and some Member of the House that the military bill would contain a paragraph that would tend to cure the situation that was brought about through the interpretation of the Welch Act.

Mr. BARBOUR. Not this bill. That matter has been considered, as I understand, by the Committee on Appropriations and will come in later in one of the appropriation bills. It is not in this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Is it understood that some corrective language will be placed in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BARBOUR. That is my understanding. It was not intended to be in this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I was told by some one in charge of an appropriation bill—I think it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE]—that later on the situation we all had in mind brought about by the interpretation or misinterpretation of the Welch Act would be corrected by some amendment by Mr. ANTHONY, and I thought it would be inserted in this bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; I understand that it will be in some appropriation bill that is to follow.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn, and the Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL STAFF CORPS

CONTINGENCIES, MILITARY INTELLIGENCE DIVISION

For contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division, General Staff Corps, and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference, and subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals; for cost of maintenance of students and attachés; for the hire of interpreters, special agents, and guides, and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper, including \$5,000 for the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign states at war, to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, \$55,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall apply neither to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals nor to other payments made from appropriations contained in this act in compliance with the laws of foreign countries under which the military attachés are required to operate.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This appropriation, I am sure, is intended by the committee to be used exclusively for the purpose of acquiring military intelligence in the strictest sense of the word. In other words, such as the preparation of armies in other countries, the movement of troops, fortifications, and information of an absolutely military value. It so happens that in the aftermath of the war the intelligence unit of the Army, and especially some of the reserve officers who were in that unit during the war, have taken upon themselves activities in prying into the private affairs and viewpoints of their fellow citizens. They have become the keepers, so to speak, of their brother's patriotism. Everyone's loyalty is measured by them by the volume of shouting for larger Army and bigger Navy. Most of these amateur sleuths—branding others as pacifists, because they seek to prevent another World War—got themselves in the intelligence unit and kept from being sent across, because they were too yellow themselves to get in any combatant branch of the Army.

We had a glaring instance of that in the incident related yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL]. A sergeant in the Military Intelligence Service made a complaint and filed an affidavit charging a Member of Congress with violating the franking privilege, when as a matter of fact, after careful investigation it was found that there was no foundation at all for any such charge. Members will recollect that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] took the floor and exhibited a large number of envelopes that had been returned and opened them in our presence, and in not one of them was a single item that was not entitled to the franking privilege. This man knowingly committed perjury, and apparently is still in the service. He represents the type used to do this kind of work. We should know that this appropriation will be used under the strictest interpretation of the law, and that such interference, such extravagance and unnecessary activity in collecting and collating the viewpoint of citizens of this country does not come within the scope of the law or the appropriation.

Only recently, Mr. Chairman, some one in the War Department has tabulated a chart showing the membership in various organizations and churches, to show that there is an organized movement in this country against war. If there is an organized movement against war in this country, it is a wholesome thing, and it will be found that among the American citizens who are active in bringing about this idea for the prevention of war there are a great many who saw active service in the war. I am convinced that these diligent sleuths are in the pay of munition makers. I fail to see how the War Department can justify the use of public funds for such unlawful purposes. Anyone or any organization that goes on record or takes a stand or assumes an attitude for the prevention of war is immediately branded by these paid agents. That does not come within the scope of the appropriation providing for military intelligence, and I do hope that the committee in providing these funds will scrutinize the way in which they were spent, and also go into the employment and the duties and the services rendered by officers and men in the intelligence unit.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. On page 8 of the bill, commencing on line 5, we find the language:

Provided, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall apply neither to subscriptions to foreign and professional newspapers—

And so forth.

That language occurs in four or five places in the bill. I have never heard anybody yet object to that language. Why does not the chairman offer an amendment inserting the word "hereafter," so that there will be no necessity of putting it in each time?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, I would object to that. These are annual appropriations, and it is all right to go along in this way and, where an exception is necessary, it ought to be provided for.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

PAY, ETC., OF THE ARMY

For pay of officers of the line and staff, \$32,082,469; pay of warrant officers, \$2,053,872; aviation increase to commissioned and warrant officers of the Army, \$1,585,508; additional pay to officers for length of service, \$8,626,302; pay of enlisted men of the line and staff, not including the Philippine Scouts, \$51,410,547; aviation increase to enlisted men of the Army, \$528,210; pay of enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, \$1,040,390; additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, \$3,049,453; pay of the officers on the retired list, \$7,749,121; increased pay to retired officers on active duty, \$168,650; pay of retired enlisted men, \$11,484,253; increased pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty, \$6,152; pay of retired pay clerks, \$5,062; pay of retired veterinarians, \$1,785; pay of not to exceed 65 civil-service messengers at \$1,200 each at headquarters of the several Territorial departments, corps areas, Army and corps headquarters, Territorial districts, tactical divisions and brigades, service schools, camps, and ports of embarkation and debarkation, \$77,340; pay and allowances of contract surgeons, \$51,756; pay of nurses, \$850,660; pay of hospital matrons, \$600; rental allowances, including allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, \$6,611,033; subsistence allowances, \$5,881,205; interest on soldiers' deposits, \$75,000; payment of exchange by officers serving in foreign countries, and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War, by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the War Department, when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Army at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$1,000; additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnish their own mounts, \$210,000; in all, \$133,550,368; and the money herein appropriated for "Pay, etc., of the Army" shall be accounted for as one fund: *Provided*, That the number of horses owned by any officer of the Army occasioning any public expense, including extra compensation, shall be reduced to one on July 1, 1929, and no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense on account of a Government-owned horse used by any officer who has a privately owned mount occasioning public expense, including extra compensation, except in the case of an officer serving with troops whose privately owned mount may be sick or injured, and except in the case of an officer away from his regular post of duty: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1930 the sum herein appropriated for pay of officers shall not be available for the pay of any persons initially appointed or commissioned in any of the promotion-list branches of the Regular Army after June 30, 1929, except (1) from graduates of the United States Military Academy, (2) from warrant officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, and (3) persons appointed or commissioned in accordance with law in the Army Air Corps.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the provision, beginning in line 18 on page 11,

down to and inclusive of line 2 on page 12, upon the ground that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is in effect a repeal or an annulment of a positive provision of existing law, a positive statute passed in 1878, which provides that where officers are required to be mounted and provide their own horses, two may be maintained at public expense in case the officer is below the grade of general and three in the case of officers of the grade of general. This is a repeal of the present law.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, the provision is clearly in order under the Holman rule, because it reduces the amount of the appropriation necessary for this item below what it would be if the language were stricken out. It is a limitation and a reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an expert in parliamentary law, but I have understood that the Holman rule related to what would be in effect a new provision of law, which would limit an appropriation, that it would not cover the case of a positive repeal of an existing statute.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If it reduces the appropriation, it would.

Mr. BARBOUR. This is not a repeal. It relates simply to this appropriation bill, and is a reduction in the amount of money carried for this purpose. Therefore it is a reduction in the amount of the appropriation that would be necessary if this language were not in the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has just stated that if it reduces the appropriation it would be in order. I presume the gentleman has reference to the Holman rule. I do not think it would necessarily follow that it would be in order coming from this committee. Is it the sole contention that it is in order because it reduces the appropriation?

Mr. BARBOUR. The language objected to provides that the number of horses owned by any officer in the Army occasioning public expense, including extra compensation, shall be reduced to one on July 1, 1929—

and no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense on account of a Government-owned horse used by any officer who has a privately owned mount occasioning public expense, including extra compensation, except in the case of an officer serving with troops whose privately owned mount may be sick or injured, and except in the case of an officer away from his regular post of duty.

The law itself provides that officers of different grades may have certain allowances for a certain number of horses privately owned.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mounted officers.

Mr. BARBOUR. Of course. They are mounted officers. A general might have three.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, they have some of these privately owned horses even in the Air Corps.

Mr. BARBOUR. A general might have three horses. He gets no allowance for that. No one above the grade of captain gets any allowance for his horse, but they do get forage and stabling. From and including a captain on down they are allowed \$150 per year for one horse, \$200 a year for two horses, and forage and stabling accommodations for two horses. The purpose of the language in the bill is to limit that allowance both in money and forage and stabling accommodations to one horse instead of two, and in some cases more, during the life of this bill. It reduces the monetary allowance by \$50 in the case of two horses, and it reduces the forage allowance about \$125 per year per horse, so that it is clearly a reduction in the appropriation and a limitation upon the expenditure of this money.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So far as I am concerned I have no objection to the legislation. But I am interested in it as a parliamentary question.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, my point is that this amendment in effect changes a provision of law which has been in effect now for 50 years, providing for the maintenance of horses for mounted officers. Of course it was for the purpose of encouraging officers to cultivate horsemanship.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] attempted to inject a facetious element into the discussion. It is quite conceivable that officers in the Air Service might have to perform duties that would require them to be mounted. That does not seem to me to be in any way pertinent to the point. The point is this, that the provision provides—

That the number of horses owned by any officer of the Army occasioning any public expense, including extra compensation, shall be reduced to one on July 1, 1929.

Now there is a positive direction of law which is inconsistent with the law of 1878, and which in effect nullifies the statute of 1878. This provision is not necessarily confined to this appropriation bill, but it is for all time. I repeat the language:

Provided, That the number of horses owned by any officer of the Army occasioning any public expense, including extra compensation, shall be reduced to one on July 1, 1929.

There is a positive direction reducing the number of horses to be maintained at public expense which a mounted officer may have.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; it is not that. That refers to allowances he may have for the upkeep of the horse. This is a positive reduction in the number of horses he may have.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Not at all. The qualifying language comes afterwards. The language of the first clause of the paragraph is general in character, providing that the number of horses shall be reduced to one. Feeling as I do that this would be an extremely unfortunate change to make at this time, I am prepared for the ruling of the Chair, without further argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] is entirely right in his contention that the proviso against which he has made a point of order is legislation on an appropriation bill. This is the purpose of the language, and the only purpose to change existing law. The question is, Is it in order under our rules?

In order to come within the rules the present occupant of the chair thinks it must either come in under the Holman rule or as a limitation. The proviso in question can be divided into two separate and distinct propositions. The first is, "That the number of horses owned by any officer of the Army occasioning any public expense, including extra compensation, shall be reduced to one on July 1, 1929." This is one substantive proposition, reducing the number of horses for which an officer shall have compensation allowance; and the Chair thinks it clearly brings itself under the Holman rule because under the present law more than one horse occasioning public expense is allowed. If the provision has any effect at all, it causes a reduction in the number of horses, a corresponding reduction in the compensation allowed, and is therefore in order under the Holman rule.

The second proposition, beginning on line 21 on page 11, is that—

No appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense on account of a Government-owned horse used by any officer who has a privately owned mount occasioning public expense, including extra compensation, except in the case of an officer serving with troops whose privately owned mount may be sick or injured, and except in the case of an officer away from his regular post of duty.

This portion of the proviso is clearly a limitation. It simply places a limitation upon the expenditure of appropriations carried in this bill, saying, in effect, that no part of this appropriation shall be expended if it is to be used on account of a Government-owned horse by an officer who has a privately owned mount. The Chair thinks that this is a proper limitation from a parliamentary standpoint which the House has the right to place on any appropriation carried in a general appropriation bill. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I now move to strike out the paragraph in question, namely, from the word "*Provided*," appearing on line 18 of page 11, down to and including line 2 of page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Beginning on page 11, line 18, after the word "*Provided*," strike out the remainder of the page and down to and including line 2 on page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think the discussion on the point of order clearly indicates the purpose of the amendment. It seems to me that no good reason has been presented by the committee why the rule of allowance which has been in effect in the last 50 years in the Army should at this particular time be changed. Horsemanship and the encouragement of horsemanship are just as important considerations at this time as they were at that time. The main purpose, of course, was to encourage officers whose duties require them to be mounted to provide themselves with a suitable number of horses.

It would, of course, promote a much better service were mounted officers not restricted to one mount. It has always been the custom that a general commanding a division or a corps, or higher ranking generals of the Army, should have more than one mount.

I realize, of course, in this day when the motor has become of such general use, that there might be some little modification, possibly, of the necessity, but it seems to me that it is

important to-day that our officers should be encouraged to ride, so as to avoid the results of the sedentary life that comes from a too liberal use of motors, with all the advantages that come from the cultivation of horsemanship. Therefore I feel this provision should not be adopted and that this restriction should be eliminated. In any event it involves a very paltry amount of money, namely, \$40,000, in view of the consideration involved. I do not think we should deprive the mounted officers of the Army of this privilege afforded them by 50 years of usage and law, a privilege which they have enjoyed. I trust the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, this matter was gone into in the general statement on the bill and also in the discussion of the point of order. The sole purpose of the committee in bringing this language in is to reduce the amount of this appropriation. It is the opinion of the committee that we are not justified in spending the amount of money that has heretofore been expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have always been interested in Tommy Atkins and sort of commiserated with him in all his woes. Therefore I have a corresponding interest in the fellow who goes under the name of Bill Hart, or some other name, and occupies the position in our Army that Tommy Atkins occupies in the British Army. How many men are in the United States Army in accordance with the bill?

Mr. BARBOUR. The bill provides for an average strength of 118,750 enlisted men.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. How many common soldiers, as they are called?

Mr. BARBOUR. They are enlisted men. None of our soldiers are common soldiers.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Well, the word "common" has a well-accepted meaning. I do not mean it in a sinister way or to reflect upon them at all, and the gentleman knows that. How many enlisted men are there? They are not common, of course, but the fellows at the bottom are treated by the Government, it appears to me, in a common or cheap way as regards pay.

Mr. BARBOUR. There are 118,750 enlisted men. There are 6,500 Philippine Scouts. They are in the Philippine Islands. Our soldiers are the best paid soldiers in the world.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. How many officers are there?

Mr. BARBOUR. Twelve thousand officers are provided for in this bill, including the Air Corps.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. What is the pay of enlisted men?

Mr. BARBOUR. There are several grades. They start in at what they call privates, seventh class, and then they work up through several grades and length of service classifications.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Let us get to the bottom ones.

Mr. BARBOUR. If the gentleman wants that, it is all set forth in detail in the hearings.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Can not the gentleman answer the question I have propounded?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes, indeed. But I say it is all set forth in detail in the hearings, and if the gentleman will turn to page 139 he will find it all in detail.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Which reminds me of the fact that the Roman laws had to be promulgated and Caracalla set them up so high and in such fine print that nobody could see them or read them. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARBOUR. If the gentleman will listen, I will tell him what this is. An enlisted man of the first grade, with less than 4 years' service, gets \$126 per month; for over 4 years' service, \$132.30 per month; for over 8 years' service, \$138.60 per month; for over 12 years' service, \$144.90 per month; and on up to over 20 years' service, when he gets \$157.50 per month. That is an enlisted man, first grade. The grades and classes go down to the seventh grade, sixth class, and there are several grades and classes in between with different lengths of service.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Let us get to the mud sills—the foundation.

Mr. BARBOUR. A private of the seventh grade, sixth class, with less than 4 years' service, gets \$24 a month, and that ranges up to \$29.25 a month for over 20 years' service. Then there are a large number of grades and lengths of service in between that and the first grade, which is the highest.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Is \$24 the lowest pay?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I understood it was between \$15 and \$18.

Mr. BARBOUR. No. According to the information furnished to the committee it is \$24 a month.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Let me ask the chairman this question in all sincerity: Do you believe you are going to make the American Army a place where American youth, ambitious, but without any prestige behind them and without any influence to find its way up through military channels, will enlist under those circumstances—that is, start as an enlisted man at \$24 per month, with \$29 as the ultima Thule?

Mr. BARBOUR. The highest pay for an enlisted man is \$157.50 per month. They are having no difficulty in getting all the enlistments the Army requires, and the enlisted men receive much more than their pay in the way of subsistence, quarters, clothing, medical care, and many other things.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. What is the percentage of desertions?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is all set out in the hearings, but it is something like 5 per cent. Does the gentleman want me to read the hearings to him?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. No.

Mr. BARBOUR. There are over 1,600 printed pages.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. If the gentleman is not prepared to answer the question that is all right, and I can understand there are difficulties in the way.

Mr. BARBOUR. I shall be glad to answer any question the gentleman may propound, but the gentleman can find all this in the hearings without taking up the time of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. That may be all right if the committee wants to be so expeditious about putting this bill through.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; we will try to give everybody all the time they want to discuss it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I thought the gentleman and his committee wanted discussion of these matters and invited such discussion. I thought that was the purpose of our consideration of the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is true, and I am telling the gentleman where he can find the information without taking up the time of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. There has not been so much time taken up. The Senate will probably take a month to consider this bill if it so desires.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman asked a question that requires one-half page of fine print to answer and I have referred the gentleman to the page where he can get the information and he has objected to that method of getting the information.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I hope the gentleman is not incensed at an inquiry on the part of one of the Members of this House.

Mr. BARBOUR. Not at all.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. It looks to me like the major part of our military and naval appropriations are for the big fish and very little for the enlisted men or, as they are sometimes called by way of description and not derogatively, "common soldiers" and "common seamen." Twenty-four dollars per month is not an attractive amount to any American youth no matter how eager he may be to join the Army. For an opulent country like ours it is not a creditable attitude. There are so many other avenues opened up to a boy of spirit, where the pay is sufficiently high, that he will forego his natural bent to attach himself to the military service of his country, and will, though reluctantly, cast his lot with some civilian occupation. That is one of the reasons why our Regular Army causes many of us to think of the celebrated musical comedy, the Milk White Flag, by the famous Hoyt, the purpose of which was to show that the only reason for the existence of the poor soldiers of the awkward squad was to excuse or justify the large number of officers, whose duties were largely social and whose rank made them attractive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to this section when the bill is again taken up in committee for consideration in order not to delay matters. I understand it is the purpose to adjourn very soon.

Mr. BARBOUR. For what purpose does the gentleman make the request?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have an amendment which I am sure the gentleman will not agree to, and, judging from the present temper of the committee with the very small attendance, I do not think I would get many votes for my amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15712, the War Department appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIABILITY OF OWNERS OF VESSELS

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 14483) fixing the liability of owners of vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, may be rereferred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I may say I do this after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and with his concurrence.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that this bill may be rereferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it agreed that the bill properly belongs to that committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that at the time the Chair referred the bill he thought it was a very close question. He has been informed by the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that this rereference is satisfactory.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NEW YEAR'S GREETINGS

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech delivered New Year's Day by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following New Year's greetings to the American people from Congressman ROBERT ALEXIS GREEN of the second district of Florida over radio station WJSV, Washington, D. C., made January 1, 1929:

I rejoice with the people of America in the happiness and brightness of the new year. Our Nation is at peace with the world. There is nothing more worthy than that of being a plain American citizen, because America is, in my opinion, the greatest of all nations, offering freedom, prosperity, opportunity, and equality to each and every one of its citizens. It leads in scientific, economical, industrial, moral, and social development. No more cosmopolitan or noble citizenship among the rank and file is to be found anywhere.

In extending my greetings to the American citizen I admonish them to preserve and conserve our Nation's natural resources; to exercise economy and avoid waste in domestic and public life; to exercise frugality, honesty, and thrift; to abide by the laws of the respective States and the Nation; to uphold and support constituted authority; better educate the youth of the land; and at all times bear in mind that ultimate happiness is permanently realized only through moral and spiritual excellency.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'CONNOR of New York, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 5, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, January 5, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Favoring the ratification by the United States Senate of the Kellogg peace pact (H. Res. 264).

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(10 a. m.)

A hearing before the special joint committee investigating the Northern Pacific land grants.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(11 a. m.)

Authorizing the President, under certain conditions, to invite the participation of other nations in the Chicago World's Fair, providing for the admission of their exhibits, and for other purposes (H. J. Res. 365).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

723. A letter from the President of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

724. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting draft of a bill to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ANTHONY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 15848. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 1462. An act providing for the necessary surveys, studies, investigations, and engineering of the Columbia Basin reclamation project, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11963. A bill for the relief of Leo B. Thome; without amendment (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 15848) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 15849) authorizing Richard H. Klein, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the borough of Liverpool, Perry County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 15850) for the construction of a bridge by the Bainbridge Island Chamber of Commerce across Agate Pass adjoining Bainbridge Island with the mainland in Kitsap County, State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15851) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at Kittanning, in the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 15852) to regulate the minimum age limit for enlistments in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 15853) to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," as amended by the act of May 28, 1928; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 15854) to provide for the sale of the old post office and courthouse building and site at

Syracuse, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 15855) to amend section 311 of the World War veterans act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 15856) granting the consent of Congress to the Cedar Point Bridge Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Ohio, of Sandusky, Erie County, Ohio, to construct a bridge across Sandusky Bay in the city of Sandusky, Erie County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 15857) to provide for the improving of the Waterloo, Jessup, Odenton, and Millersville Highway, connecting the Washington and Baltimore Boulevard with the Crain Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 15858) to provide for the payment of compensation to the dependents of World War veterans in certain cases; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15859) to provide for delivery of certain mail matter upon a date specified by sender; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 15860) to authorize and require the delivery to the War Department of arms and munitions of war condemned under section 241, title 22, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 15861) to amend section 5 of an act approved March 2, 1919, known as the war minerals act; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 369) to authorize the erection of a marker to commemorate the poem, The Blue and the Gray, and the event which inspired its composition; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CRISP: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 370) providing for the completion of Dam No. 2 and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals for the manufacture and distribution of fertilizer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY: Resolution (H. Res. 282) to pay Paul L. Miller, son of William H. Miller, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months of his compensation and an additional \$250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 15862) granting an increase of pension to Sophia P. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15863) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Matlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15864) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Yates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 15865) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Piper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15866) granting an increase of pension to Alwilda Charlton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 15867) for the relief of David Schwartz; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15868) granting a pension to Catherine Lahey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 15869) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Gussin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 15870) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Mae Yurasko; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 15871) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15872) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Moss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 15873) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15874) granting an increase of pension to Emma T. Vandewater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 15875) granting a pension to James A. Chaffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 15876) granting a pension to Carrie Russell Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15877) granting a pension to John Sherman Corwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 15878) for the relief of Charles F. Schaber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 15879) granting a pension to Joseph C. Neihemer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 15880) granting a pension to William Hinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 15881) granting an increase of pension to Delia Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 15882) for the relief of Earl D. Barkly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 15883) granting a pension to Margaret Ralston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15884) granting a pension to Ella M. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15885) granting a pension to Lucy C. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15886) granting a pension to Alice Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 15887) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Stroud; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 15888) for the relief of Charles Trudell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 15889) granting a pension to Sophia A. Beers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KVALE: A bill (H. R. 15890) for the relief of Donald Alexander Peterson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 15891) granting a pension to Jennie Lynn Sprague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15892) for the relief of hay growers in Brazoria, Galveston, and Harris Counties, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 15893) authorizing surveys and investigations to determine the best methods and means of utilizing the waters of the Cimarron River system and its tributaries in southwestern Colfax County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 15894) granting a pension to Elizabeth Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 15895) granting an increase of pension to Carrie B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15896) granting a pension to Peter T. Keeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15897) granting a pension to Mary L. Skidmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15898) granting a pension to Charity Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 15899) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Byam; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15900) for the relief of Charles H. Young; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 15901) for the relief of George W. Hayden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15902) for the relief of Vincent Baranasies; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15903) for the relief of Touma Tamexian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15904) granting a pension to George Stovall Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 15905) granting a retirement annuity to G. G. Laugen; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 15906) granting a pension to Ida A. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15907) granting a pension to Charles R. Reist; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15908) granting a pension to Asbury B. Richman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 15909) for the relief of the Williams Seed & Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 15910) granting a pension to Margaret Harrold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15911) for the relief of Anthony Wade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARE: A bill (H. R. 15912) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Winer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 15913) granting a pension to Thomas J. Coogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 15914) for the relief of John T. Painter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 15915) granting a pension to Mary A. Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8135. Petition of the Democratic State central committee of the State of Arkansas, on the death of Hon. W. A. Oldfield, late a Representative from the second district of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Library.

8136. Petition of the board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, concerning the titles of certain lands in said county; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8137. Claim of Claib L. Cook, sr., of Pekin, Ill., for damages done to certain lands and crops belonging to him during his ownership and tenancy thereof, i. e., during the years of 1920, 1922, and 1924; to the Committee on Claims.

8138. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of National Lumber Manufacturers Association, requesting that the scope of any legislative enactment which will, under suitable safeguards, permit control of production in the coal and oil industries, be extended to include also forest products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8139. Also, petition of E. F. Drew & Co. (Inc.), protesting against the consideration of the Haugen bill (H. R. 10958); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8140. Also, petition of the Guaranty Co., of New York City, N. Y., requesting additional appropriations to Postmaster General to enforce the postal fraud laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8141. Also, petition of the Medical Society of the County of Kings, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Newton bill (H. R. 14070); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8142. Also, petition of American Petroleum Institute, recommending that Congress study the requirements of Federal bureaus engaged in research work on petroleum problems and provide adequate funds to be used by these bureaus; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8143. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of John J. Dunn and 22 others, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8144. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the New York State Chamber of Commerce, indorsing House bill 11886 and Senate bill 3721, to establish the office of captain of the port of New York and to define his duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8145. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of residents of Coffey County, Kans., protesting against House bill 78, and all compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8146. By Mr. McFADDEN: Resolution favoring an upward revision of the existing tariff law, signed by Joseph W. Grundy, president, and H. W. Moore, secretary, of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8147. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring appropriations for New York Harbor and vicinity for the deepening and widening of existing channels; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

8148. Also, petition of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, Washington, D. C., favoring legislation to include the control of lumber; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8149. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the building of the 15 cruisers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8150. Also, petition of the manufacturers' conference on prison industries, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 7729, convict labor bill, with Senate amendments; to the Committee on Labor.

8151. By Mr. PEAVER: Opposition of the Commercial Club at Phillips, Wis., to the adoption of the Robinson bill, concerning the Pullman surcharge rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8152. Also, petition of Park Falls Commercial Club, in opposition to the bill affecting the Pullman surcharge rate as introduced by Senator ROBINSON of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8153. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of the W. A. Nabors Fruit Co., urging a tariff on turkeys and on all farm products of this country which have to meet foreign competition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8154. Also, petition of Woldert Peanut Products Co., urging increase of tariff on peanuts and peanut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8155. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Tylerdale Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Washington, Pa.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Donora, Pa.; and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Charleroi, Pa., in support of the Lankford Sunday rest bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.